CANADIAN THESIS
THESES CANADIENNES

COOGAN, Robin Tracy
CODE-SWITCHING AND CLASSROOM
TYPE

ISBN 0-612-87567-9
MQ-87567

In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

Code-switching and classroom type

by

Robin Tracy Coogan

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

in

Applied Linguistics

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2003

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisisitons et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87567-9
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87567-9

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Robin Tracy Coogan

Title of Thesis: Code-switching and classroom type

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

September 25, 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Code-switching and classroom type" submitted by Robin Tracy Coogan in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics.

Dr. Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain

Dr. Terry Nadasdi

Dr. Michelle Daveluy

August 18, 2003

Abstract

This thesis examines the code-switching behaviours of both the students and teacher in two different classroom types: a German bilingual class and a French immersion class. This study presents an in-depth discussion on the research related to code-switching, as well as the terminology used in code-switching studies. It looks at how the first language is used in the classroom and to what purpose code-switching is employed.

Six different functions of code-switching are presented and discussed, as well as several unknown cases. This study suggests that the classroom type, as well as language competency may be two possible influencing factors in an individual's ability and/or decision to code-switch. The atmosphere or the status of the different languages in the classroom, and how well an individual speaks the languages may affect whether or not a student will switch between the languages used in the classroom.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Karen and Brian Coogan, without whom none of this would have been possible. Their unfailing love and support ensured that this thesis would come to fruition. For that and much more, I thank you.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of many people, in particular, Mr. Norman Sieweke and Ms. Naaz Ishani, who were instrumental in the completion of my thesis. I also wish to thank the Edmonton Public School Board and the schools involved, for allowing me to observe classes and collect my data.

I would also like to show my appreciation to Mr. Dana Duke, who assisted me in the final stages and without whom I would not have been able to complete this thesis.

I wish to make a very special thank you to Dr. Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain, my supervisor and mentor in this project. Her unfailing support and invaluable direction provided me with the tools to complete this study and introduced me to the intriguing realm of linguistics.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Overview of Previous Research 1
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Definitions and terminology 2
1.3 Approaches to code-switching 9
1.3.1 Grammatical approaches 9
1.3.1.1 Universal constraints 13
1.3.1.2 Free morpheme and equivalence constraints 13
1.3.1.3 Matrix language frame model 14
1.3.2 Pragmatic approaches 15
1.3.2.1 Situational versus metaphorical code-switching 15
1.3.2.2 Conversational functions of code-switching 16
1.3.2.3 Social network approach to code-switching 23
1.3.2.4 Code-switching and power-wielding 24
1.3.3 Code-switching as a code in its own right 26
1.4 Attitudes towards code-switching 28
1.5 Classroom code-switching 29
1.5.1 Functions of classroom code-switching 29
1.5.2 Bilingual classroom policies 31
1.5.3 First language use in the classroom 36
1.6 Conclusion 40
II. Methodology 41
2.1 Introduction 41
2.2 Description of participants 42
2.3 Description of classroom types 43
2.4 Data collection 45
III. Results and analysis 50
3.1 Questionnaire results 50
3.1.1 Background questionnaire 50
3.1.2 Student language use questionnaire 53
3.1.3 Legal guardian language use questionnaire 59
3.2 Classroom functions of code-switching 63
3.2.1 Fallback 64
3.2.2 Translation/clarification 68
3.2.3 Community membership 73
3.2.4 Repair 75
3.2.5 Power-wielding 76
3.2.6 Personalization versus objectivization 80
3.2.7 Unknown occurrences of code-switching 83
3.2.8 Summary 86
3.3 Metalinguistic commentary 89
3.3.1 Induced metalinguistic commentary 93

IV. Concluding Remarks 95
4.1 Implications for the classroom 98
4.2 Study limitations 99
4.3 Directions for further research 100
4.4 Final Statement 101

Endnotes 102
Bibliography 103
Appendix A: Sample background questionnaire 106
Appendix B: Sample student language use questionnaire 107
Appendix C: Sample legal guardian language use questionnaire 108
Appendix D: Sample consent form 109
Appendix E: Sample teacher consent form 110

List of Tables

Table Number	Title of Table	Page Number
1	Background questionnaire results	50
2	Languages spoken at home	51
3	Length of time attending classroom type	53
4	Amount of time reading German/French material not assigned by the teacher	54
5	Amount of time spent watching German/French programs or movies not assigned by the teacher	55
6	Amount of time spent living with family and/or close friends who speak German/French	56
6A	Modified amount of time spent living with family and/ close friends who speak German/French	56
7	Number of students who spoke German/French while living with family and/or close friends who can speak German/French	57
8	People with whom the students speak the most German/ French	58
9	Number of legal guardians able to speak German or French	59
9A	Number of legal guardians who speak German/French with the students if they are able	60
10	Frequency of encouragement from the legal guardians	61

11	Number of fallback occurrences	66
11A	Number of dispreferred choice occurrences	67
12	Number of translation/clarification occurrences	69
13	Number of unknown occurrences	83
14	Summary of code-switching functions	87
15	Number of occurrences of metalinguistic commentary	90

Chapter I

Introduction and Overview of Previous Research

1.1 Introduction

Many researchers have looked at bilingual speech and tried to figure out how code-switching is used in these communities and whether there are constraints on that usage. Others have expanded the study of code-switching from bilingual speech communities and focused on this phenomenon's presence in the classroom community.

My study examines the code-switching behaviors of bilingual students in two different school types: a German bilingual classroom and a French immersion classroom. It looks at how code-switching is employed by both the students and the teacher and hopes to determine whether or not the different classroom types affect the students decision to code-switch.

This study presents first an overview of the previous research, focusing on terminology, uses, constraints, and a discussion on classroom code-switching. The next section provides a description of the data collection methods used in the study, as well as of the participants and classroom environments involved. Finally, the results are presented and compared between the two classrooms, and between the students and teachers. The study's limitations are also discussed as well as some implications for the classroom and directions for further research.

This thesis will demonstrate that language competency and classroom type may affect an individual's ability and/or decision to code-switch. This

study found that the teachers code-switched almost as much as the students had, and one of them actually did code-switch more in the classroom. A total of six functions of code-switching were used in both classrooms and include code-switching as a fallback mechanism; in order to translate and/or clarify; to indicate community membership; to repair a wrong language choice; to wield power over another; and to indicate the degree of speaker involvement, or personalization versus objectivization.

89 code-switches in all were found in the data, including 5 unknown cases. The majority of these switches, or 60, occurred in the German bilingual classroom, the remainder were in the French Immersion class. The fact that English is more acceptable and that there are several native speakers and heritage language learners in the German bilingual class may be two of the possible influencing factors in an individual's decision to code-switch. The quantitative results presented lend support to the qualitative interpretations discussed in this thesis.

1.2 Definitions and terminology

The field of code-switching study first emerged in the 1970's, and research on this phenomenon continues on today. There are many different theories about code-switching and many different variations on the definition. Each definition retains the basic concept of code-switching and takes on slight variations to suit the study being done. Because of this, there is much confusion when comparing works of different researchers, as much of the code-switching terminology is contradictory. Different researchers use different terms to

describe the phenomenon of code-switching. Some use the terms code-alternation, code-mixing, borrowing, or transfer, and since there is no universal definition for any of them, researchers tend to use them as would best be applied to their study. As Blyth (1995: 173) points out, it seems that the most basic concepts are fuzzy at best and their boundaries are blurred. In order to better understand the term code-switching and the terminology used in its application, an examination of several different definitions and an overview of the terminology are necessary.

Despite this variation in terminology, most of the views on code-switching fall into two different groups: those who see it as the juxtaposition of two codes and those who see it as the integration of one code into another. Gumperz (1982: 59) was one of the first to introduce code-switching and defines it as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems". Other researchers, such as Timm (1993), Clyne (1987), and Poplack (1980), describe code-switching in much the same way, seeing it as the alternation or switching of two different languages. They believe that the switching occurs within a single discourse or at different levels within the conversation, either within a sentence or between sentences. Auer (1998: 2) looks at code-switching from the conversational perspective. He agrees that it is the alternating use of two or more codes within one conversational episode. Auer (1995: 116) also implies that the participants of the conversation recognize the juxtaposition for what it

is, that is, they understand the relationship of the alternation between the different codes.

Faltis (1989) and Myers-Scotton (1995) examine code-switching from the insertion perspective. Faltis (1989: 119) believes that when one code-switches, they either stop speaking one language and begin to speak another, or they insert unadapted patterns of one language into the patterns of the other. Myers-Scotton (1995) has developed a complete framework, which she entitles the matrix language frame model. In this model, she takes a grammatical approach and looks at code-switching based on the concept of insertion and integration of one language into the other (see section 1.3.1.3).

Many studies have looked at the difference between code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing, transfer, insertion, transcodic markers or other concepts in use (Franceschini, 1998: 51). Some researchers believe that there is a definite differentiation and other people believe that, indeed, there are differences, but that these differences are unimportant in code-switching. There has been much research, in particular, on the distinction between "code-switching" and "borrowing". Gumperz (1982: 66) believes a borrowing to be an introduction of single words or frozen, idiomatic expressions from one language into the other. He contrasts it with code-switching by stating that code-switching relies on the *meaningful* juxtaposition of what speakers have to process as strings formed according to the rules of two distinct grammatical systems, whether it be conscious or not. According to Gumperz, the switch in itself has a meaning and is rule-governed, where the borrowing is a word or

expression from one language, and both languages' grammatical rules do not govern the use of the word or expression into the other language. Gumperz (1982: 68) also states that borrowing is a word and clause level phenomenon and that code-switching is a matter of conversational interpretation, with relevant inferential processes strongly affected by contextual and social presuppositions.

Muysken (1995: 189) discusses what he terms "lexical borrowings". He contrasts lexical borrowing with code-switching, saying it involves a gradual semantic specialization and, over time, a blurring of morpheme boundaries and lexical unpredictability. Romaine (1995: 143) indicates that researchers who have made a distinction between code-switching and borrowing have made the distinction based on the degree of integration of the borrowing into the base language. She cites Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan (1990), saying they believe that if the morphology and syntax are consistent with only one of the languages, then the item in question must be borrowed. On the other hand, code-switching has occurred if syntactic and morphological systems change within the sentence (Romaine, 1995: 144).

Poplack (1980: 584) identifies four types of integration into the base language. Type one occurs when the item is phonologically, morphologically and syntactically integrated into the base language. This is not code-switching; according to Poplack, this would be a borrowing. Type two is syntactically integrated, while type three is phonologically integrated and type four has no integration into the base language. All three are considered to be code-switches. Here the borrowings are integrated on all three different levels, where code-

switching is only integrated into one or no level of the base language. This is interesting, as it indicates that a code-switch retains some elements of the original language, that there are still different codes being used at one time. A borrowing is integrated into the other language, it has a defined meaning in that language, it is pronounced according to rules of the base language, and it is used in the manner that other base language grammatical items are used. Romaine (1995: 144) also points out that not all researchers agree that integration into the base language is a good indicator of the difference between code-switching and borrowing, as many single word forms demonstrate morphological integration. Verbs are quite often morphologically integrated into the base language, because verbs must indicate tense, aspect, etc. (Romaine, 1995: 144).

In Gumperz' (1982: 67) study he makes a distinction between loans and borrowings. He states that loans tend to follow the grammatical rules of the new language, while borrowings only affect one level of linguistic signaling at a time. That is, a borrowing can only affect the morphology, syntax or phonology of the base language *at one time*, it cannot affect all three, as Poplack's type one level of integration does. However, according to Poplack, an item that affects only one level at a time; type two or three, is an example of code-switching, not of borrowing. Muysken (1995: 190) also differentiates between, what he terms, nonce loans and lexical borrowings. According to him nonce loans are elements that are borrowed on the spur of the moment without having a status in the receiving speech community. This implies that borrowings are not "spur of the moment" and have a status, a meaning in the speech community.

When looking at transference, Clyne (1987: 740) also discusses the concept of integration into another language. He defines transference as when a single item is transferred from one language into the other, whether it is integrated into the grammatical and/or phonological system of the base language or not. Here the integration does not matter and affects only two levels; phonological and grammatical. What seems to be important is that a *single item* is used, which implies that a code-switch would not be a single word. However, many studies have indicated that the most frequently switched category in code-switching tends to be single nouns (Poplack, 1980: 603).

Auer (1998: 17) examines the distinction between code-switching and insertion. He states that the difference is fuzzy, and the only criterion for distinguishing between the two is that, in code-switching, the switched-to passage is perceived as a structural unit. Timm (1993: 94) looks at how to distinguish code-switching from interference. According to her, it refers to the importation of a linguistic structure from one language directly into another and works most clearly at the phonological level. To better understand this, let us take a hypothetical situation. A person is bilingual in English and Spanish and is speaking with friends, who are not bilingual, in English. This person does not switch to Spanish, rather he or she pronounces an English word according to the Spanish phonological system. That would be interference, as opposed to code-switching, as it was the intention of this individual to speak English and not Spanish.

There are many reasons why so much attention has been paid to the differences between code-switching, borrowing and other language contact phenomena. One reason may have to do with the fact that in many communities, single word switching is most common (Gardner-Chloros, 1995: 73). Another reason is that any bilingual data set contains examples of loans alongside instances of code-switching (Gardner-Chloros, 1995: 73). One problem in discerning the different terms may be that many of the words that occur, that are possible loans or code switches, belong equally to both codes. Now, not only must the term code-switching be defined, it must also be separated from other terms of language contact phenomena, not an easy task. Debates on this issue have tended to hide the fact that included within the term code switching is a large amount of different forms of bilingual behavior, that are not yet fully understood (Franceschini, 1998: 51).

Gardner-Chloros (1995: 70) presents two reasons why she believes the term code switching has become "a victim of its own success". First, it has to do with the relationship between code switching and other interlingual phenomena. Its use encourages people to believe that it is a unitary phenomenon with an objective reality, rather than a fuzzy-edged construct. Second, the use of the term "code switching" implies a binary choice, that at any given moment speakers are either operating in one language or in another, and one is clearly distinguishable from the other. Code-switching can involve more than two languages, and the languages may be very similar to one another. Distinguishing between the languages involved is not necessarily an easy task.

Many languages share features, or are derived from similar sources, especially dialects. In some instances the languages may be so close, it may be near to impossible to say whether a switch has occurred or not. Also, implying that a person is speaking in one language or in another, loses sight of the possibility that that person may in fact be operating in *both* languages at one time.

It is easy to see how one can become confused due to the different definitions of code-switching and terminology in use. Auer (1998: 21) points out that what linguists mean by the term code-switching is in need of clarification, and that this clarification will not be an easy one to make. However, Auer states that a clarification is essential in order to determine its relevance for linguistic theory at large. Perhaps more importantly, as Clyne (1987: 741) argues, the vagueness in terminology can also influence the results of research. The fact that there is no universal definition a researcher can fall back on, is not necessarily a bad thing. This way, the term can be slightly modified to better suit the study being conducted, but still retain the concept of code-switching.

1.3 Approaches to code-switching

There are many different approaches to code-switching, each with different views and focal points. In this section, I will discuss grammatical and pragmatic approaches, and I will also address the notion of code-switching being a code in its own right.

1.3.1 Grammatical approaches

As the name implies, grammatical approaches examine the grammar and syntax of code-switching. The main focus is finding out how speakers combine the two grammars of the different systems, and there is much interest in seeing if there are constraints that govern the different switches.

Most investigations agree that code-switching is rule-governed in many aspects, despite the fact that there is little agreement on the exact nature of the rules involved (Poplack, 1980: 585). Poplack (1980: 585) proposes that grammatical rules have generally taken the form of categorical constraints based on acceptability judgments of invented instances of code-switching. Gumperz' (1982) work, though generally closer to the pragmatic approaches, also introduced ten constraints on code-switching (Gumperz, 1980: 86). He states that if code-switching is to be meaningful, it must be subject to some forms of linguistic regularity, or rules. Once rules are identified, it is that much easier to determine those occurrences that are not meaningful, that is, those that do not follow the rules. Gumperz (1980: 89) points out that even though code-switching is subject to some constraints, these constraints are motivated by underlying factors, and these factors depend more on the pragmatics of the language than on the structural or grammatical characteristics of the language in question.

Timm (1993: 97-98) re-evaluates five constraints that she introduced in a previous study in 1975. The first states that there is no switching between the prominent subject or object and the adjacent verb. Second, no switching is possible between a verb and a following preposition or particle that is followed

by an infinitive. Third, there can be no switching between auxiliaries, including modals, and a following main verb. Fourth, there is no switching in negative constructions between the negating elements and the verb. Lastly, adjectives in noun phrases are generally in the same language as the head noun and generally follow the rule for adjective placement that is operative in the language of the head noun. Timm then states that subsequent research revealed that her constraints did not have the power of categorical rules, though they did still represent tendencies.

Muysken (1995: 178-179) claims that we should aim for universal explanations when looking for grammatical constraints on code-switching. He proposes two models, Model A and Model B. In Model A, the assumption is that the global theory makes a more limited set of switch sites available in specific instances than would be desirable. In Model B, different switching strategies occur governed by constraints specific to those strategies. Muysken believes Model A is better for three reasons. First, A makes a unified account possible. Second, in B it is not clear why, in a given situation, one strategy is preferred over the other. Third, in the absence of a global theory the relation between specific strategies and constraints remains unclear. Muysken (1995: 196) also discusses, at the end of his study, other possible occurrences of code-switching. According to him, there are four possible scenarios that would allow for code-switching. First, when there is no tight relation holding between two elements. The second scenario occurs when one follows the equivalence constraint. Third, when the switched element is morphologically encapsulated

and shielded by a functional element from the matrix language. Lastly, switching is also possible when, at the point of the switch, a word could belong to either language.

In Clyne's 1987 study, he looks at the different constraints proposed in code-switching literature, in order to determine just how universal they really are. He examines five different constraints, namely the structural integrity constraint (or equivalence constraint), the free morpheme constraint, semantic constraint, government constraint and the constraint on the switchability of closed-class groups (Clyne, 1987: 747-749). The free morpheme constraint and equivalence constraint will be discussed under its own section. In the semantic constraint, whole prepositional phrases involve figurative or temporal switches, but not locative switches. The government constraint states that switching is possible only between elements not related to government, for example the verb governs the object and therefore no switch can occur between them. The last constraint is entitled the constraint on switchability of closed-class groups. Clyne (1987: 748) states that most constraints are dependent on a general constraint on the switchability of closed class items. Closed-class items include determiners, quantifiers, prepositions, tense morphemes, complementizers and pronouns. According to Clyne (1987: 761), the evidence suggests that code-switching and its constraints are surface structure phenomena. Also, the data suggests that the structural integrity, or equivalence constraint, does apply, but only if researchers accept that the syntax of the two languages involved may have already converged.

1.3.1.1 Universal constraints

The question of the universality of constraints on code-switching is a point of great interest to researchers (Clyne 1987, Muysken 1995), yet each of the proposed constraints have been found to have exceptions. What appears to be occurring is that although any given constraint may have some kind of wider generalizability beyond the study in question, none can be considered universal in nature. As Timm (1993: 103) aptly notes, none of the constraints so far have proved to be without exceptions, however in spite of this, they are still indicative of powerful tendencies among speakers. More research is needed in order to determine if there are truly universal constraints on code-switching.

1.3.1.2 Free morpheme and equivalence constraints.

Poplack (1980) proposed two syntactic constraints on code-switching, the free morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. In the free morpheme constraint (1980: 585-586), the codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse, provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme. This holds true for all linguistic levels except the phonological. In the equivalence constraint (1980: 586), code switching will tend to occur at points in discourse where the juxtaposition of the first and second language elements do not violate a syntactic rule of either language. A switch is inhibited from occurring within a constituent generated by a rule from one language that is not shared by the other. Poplack (1980: 588) states that the simultaneous operation of the free morpheme and equivalence constraints permits only code-switches, which, when translated into either language, are grammatical according to the

rules of both the first and the second language. This indicates a large degree of competence in both languages.

1.3.1.3 Matrix language frame model

A different grammatical approach is put forth by Myers-Scotton (1995), the matrix language frame model or MLF. Although this model deals with the grammar and syntax of code-switching, just like other grammatical approaches, it differs a great deal from these other constraints. Myers-Scotton sees code-switching as an insertion process, where an embedded language is inserted into the matrix language, rather than the juxtaposition of codes that interact at different grammatically equivalent points. Myers-Scotton (1995: 235) points out what makes her study different form previous ones looking at code-switching. Earlier work focused on equivalencies in surface word order, while in the MLF model, the explanation for code-switching is found in lexically based processes.

Myers-Scotton (1995: 235) explains that at the heart of the model are two interrelated hierarchies that direct the structuring of sentences containing code-switching. The first hierarchy is the matrix language versus embedded language hierarchy. In this, one language plays a more dominant role and is labeled the matrix language. All other languages are the embedded languages. The second hierarchy is the system versus content morpheme hierarchy. System morphemes are functional (inflections, conjugations) and content morphemes are nouns, verbs, etc. The System Morpheme Principle states that the matrix

language supplies the system morphemes and the embedded language can supply only content morphemes when the two languages are mixed.

1.3.2 Pragmatic Approaches

This section will present an overview of some of the approaches to code-switching in conversation. I will look at the distinction between situational versus metaphorical switching and then move on to examine some of the many conversational functions of code-switching. I will also present a social network approach put forth by Milroy and Wei (1995) and examine how code-switching can be used as an indication of power.

1.3.2.1 Situational versus metaphorical code-switching

The introduction of distinction between situational and metaphorical switching was put forth by Blom and Gumperz in their renowned study on code-switching in Norway in 1972. Wei (1998: 157), as many researchers have done, examines this study and talks about this distinction. Situational switching is, as the name implies, triggered by a change in situation. Here extralinguistic factors come into play and affect the language choice of interlocutors. The underlying assumption in situational switching is that one of the languages is appropriate for a particular situation. For example, in a minority language situation, the minority language would be appropriate when speaking with friends and family in the home. The majority language would be used in more formal situations, such as work. Metaphorical switching occurs when there is a change in the speaker's language while the situation remains the same. None of the external factors have changed, yet something indicated to the speaker they should speak

a different language. This indicates that the metaphorical switch conveys a special communicative intent.

Jørgensen (1998: 238) makes a similar distinction using the terms situational code-switching and conversational code-switching. According to him, situational code-switching is related to the differences in classes of activities bound to certain settings in a single, almost one-to-one relationship between language use and social context. Conversation code-switching is metaphorical in relating information about how the speakers intend their words to be understood.

1.3.2.2 Conversational functions of code-switching

Gumperz (1982: 75-81) identifies, what he calls the more conversational uses of code-switching, and according to him there are six. The first use is quotations, where code-switching is clearly identifiable as a direct quotation or reported speech. Next is entitled addressee specification. Here the switch serves to direct the message to one of several possible addressees. The third type is called interjections, where switching serves to mark an interjection or sentence filler. Next is reiteration. In this, a message in one code is repeated into the other code, either literally or in a modified form. In some cases the switch is used to clarify what was said, but it often merely amplifies or emphasizes the message. Fifth is entitled message qualification, which consists of qualifying constructions, such as sentence and verb complements or predicates following a copula. The last function of code-switching is referred to as personalisation versus objectivisation. Gumperz (1982: 83) states that these

terms are rough labels which describe a large class of stylistic and semantic phenomena. Here the code contrast relates to such things as distinction between talk about action and talk as action; the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance from, a message; whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge; and whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of generally known fact. This would most closely resemble metaphorical switching, where no extralinguistic factors are involved, the choice to switch comes from within the individual. Gumperz (1982: 82) also indicates that the exact meaning will vary depending on the context and content of the conversation.

Legenhausen (1989: 62) includes these uses under one type of code-switching. Within this type, code-switching is used as a discourse strategy, where the switch occurs at specific points in an interaction to achieve certain conversational goals. According to him, on the interactional level code-switching can be used as a discourse-structuring device for emphasizing, focusing or clarification. Legenhausen (1989: 61) also argues that code-switching can be employed when a speaker runs into word finding problems or when the intended meaning can be expressed more precisely in a different language. He says that code-switching is acting as a psycholinguistic phenomenon in this instance.

Auer (1998: 4-9) makes a distinction between different types of code-switching as well, and he states that there are three types: discourse-related switching; discourse-related insertions and preference-related switching.

According to Auer the first type, discourse-related switching, occurs when code-switching is used to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance. Discourse-related insertions are the second type, and are alternations in the pattern A1[B1]A1, which often elicit episode external or ethnographic knowledge about interaction histories and cultural contexts. The last type is preference-related switching. This is the sustained divergence of language choices or language negotiation sequences. Auer says that the main difference is that in discourse-related switching, researchers search for an account for why that language is chosen at a certain point within the development of the conversation and in participant-related switching, they look for the reason within the individual who performs the switching or within his or her co-participants in the conversation. He also indicates that discourse and participant-related switching are not strictly separated and there is room for overlap.

Wei (1998) states that the conversational approach to code-switching has two advantages. First, it gives priority to the sequential implicativeness of language choice in conversation and second, it limits the external analyst's interpretations, because it relates his or her interpretations back to the members' understanding of their utterances as indicated through their behavior. In other words, the analysis is not based on what the researcher infers to be happening, rather it reflects back on the speakers themselves and attempts to account for why they chose a particular language by examining their actions in conversation.

Many studies have looked at the functions of code-switching in conversation. Alfonzetti (1998: 186) states that code-switching can work as a self-repair technique, as an alternation, or it can work together with the other techniques normally used in monolingual discourse, such as self-interruption, vowel lengthening, hesitation, pauses, repetition, etc. It may also work as a device to mark the internal structuring of conversation into constitutive sequences. Alfonzetti also states that code-switching can also be used to signal changes in footing connected with story telling in conversation.

In the study of conversational code-switching many researchers have looked at where code-switching arises, what are the conditions, if any, that are required. Franceschini (1998: 53-54) talks about what she titles "the genesis" of code switching. She indicates that code-switching is characteristically formed in a specific way, and arises in groups sharing common identities. She also states that code-switching does not originate in a single linguistic center, rather it emerges simultaneously in various places among multilinguals only if similar social circumstances are present. Some examples of the different social circumstances are: a multilingual context, group awareness, or permeability of cultural and linguistic norms. Timm (1993: 95) also believes that code-switching occurs frequently among multilinguals whose languages have been in contact for a long period of time. Franceschini (1998: 62) says that code-switching is one possible outcome of speakers interacting in a particular situation of language contact. Other possible outcomes include pidgin and creole languages. Gardner-Chloros (1995: 77) also argues that code-switching

is found in areas where creolisation or decreolisation is occurring and that it can contribute to the process of language convergence or divergence. According to her, if circumstances change in a language situation, code-switching can act as a vehicle of language shift, even after being a feature of stable bilingualism.

Gumperz (1982: 64) indicates that code-switching is perhaps most frequently found in the informal speech of members of cohesive minority groups in modern urbanizing regions who speak the native tongue at home and use the majority language at work and when dealing with members of groups other than their own. This is the distinction between a "we code" and a "they code". According to Gumperz, there is a tendency for the ethnically specific minority language to be viewed as the "we code" and to be associated with in-group and informal activities and for the majority language to serve as the "they code" and is associated with more formal, less personal out-group relations. Gardner-Chloros (1995: 82) also discusses the use of a "we code" and a "they code" as a principal function of code switching.

As Auer (1995: 116) states, any theory of conversational code-switching is likely to fail if it does not take into account that the meaning of code-switching depends on its sequential environment. Auer (1995) examines different typologies of code-switching from other researchers, in order to determine just how effective they are. According to him (1995: 201), these typologies seem to converge across bilingual communities on certain conversational loci, where switching is particularly frequent. These loci include: reported speech; change of participant constellation, in particular addressee

selection and this also includes the use of code-switching in order to include, exclude or marginalize co-participants or bystanders. Further loci are parentheses or side comments; reiterations, also called translations, repetitions or recycling; change of activity type, also known as mode shift or role shift; topic shift; puns, language play, shift of key; and topicalisation, topic or comment structure.

Auer (1995: 120-121) states that although lists like this one are useful, in that they demonstrate that some conversational loci are very susceptible to code-switching, the mere listing of these loci is problematic. He then gives four reasons why this is so. The conversational categories used for the analysis are often ill-defined, frequently there are lists of conversational loci, but no sequential analysis is carried out to demonstrate what exactly is meant by the terms. What is lacking is the proper grounding of the categories used. Secondly, the so-called typologies of code-switching often confuse conversational structures, linguistic forms and functions of code-switching. Third, the lists of loci for code-switching or typologies of functions may indicate an initial clue as to what is going on, but we do not know whether the listing will bring us closer to a theory of code-switching. Auer (1995: 121) notes that this list is not a closed one, and this shows that code-switching is used in a creative way and that it can have conversational meaning even if used in a particular conversational environment only once. The fourth and last reason given by Auer, is the most important. The listing of conversational loci for code-switching implies that code switching should have some conversational status in

both directions. Although the conversational loci mentioned may be used for switching in both directions in one speech community, the exact conversational meaning of these cases of switching is often not identical.

Auer (1995: 123) then suggests that code-switching should be viewed as a contextualisation cue. He says that code-switching works in many ways just like other contextualisation cues, and treating it as such also explains why the functions of this cue are often taken over by prosodic or gestural cues in monolingual conversation. Wei (1998: 163) indicates that the term "contextualisation cue" was coined by Gumperz (1982), and its chief function is to signal conversation participants' orientation to one another. They are the non-verbal indicators that determine how an utterance is delivered, substituted, or replaced and include intonation, speech rhythm, and lexical, phonetic and syntactic choices.

According to Auer (1995: 123-124), contextualisation cues have several different characteristics. First, they do not have the referential meaning of the kind found in lexical items, rather they, and the interpretation of the activity, are related by a process of inferencing, which itself is dependent on the context of its occurrence. The same cue may receive a different interpretation on different occasions. Second, the way in which inferencing leads to contextual interpretation can happen in two ways, either by contrasting the codes or by the inherent meaning potential of the cue. The only meaning the cue has is to indicate otherness, however, many cues do more than that. They must establish a contrast and indicate that something new is going to occur. They also restrict

the number of possible plausible inferences as to what this might be, as cues may have an inherent meaning potential. Lastly, contextualisation cues often bundle together. Auer (1995: 124) says that code-switching shares these features, but does have some of its own characteristics, and for this reason, there is a need for a specification of the contextualisation value of this cue, that is, a theory of code-switching.

1.3.2.3 Social network approach to code-switching

Before attempting to account for code-switching behavior, Milroy and Wei (1995: 137) believe that the researcher must have some indication of how language choice is restricted for some speakers or affected by different social values assigned to the languages. Gumperz (1982) talks a great deal about network analysis and states (1982: 71) that this type of analysis focuses on the social ties established by members of a community. A social network can be seen as a web that links people together across a whole society (Milroy and Wei 1995: 138).

The general assumption in Milroy and Wei's (1995: 138) approach is that variation in a speaker's social network will systematically affect how they use the languages available to them. They indicate (1995: 139) that closeknit social networks consisting of strong ties to other members, appear to have the ability to enforce local norms, including linguistic norms. Milroy and Wei (1995: 146) found in their study that speakers with different network patterns take on different language-choice patterns with specific individuals. Their data also suggests that particular languages are associated with particular groups who

have similar types of social network, but that these types can also vary among individuals despite these associations (1995: 146). For this reason, they argue that the social network approach is a more economical way to account for patterns of language choice, than other, related variables. It does this by drawing attention to the behavior of speakers who deviate from the norms, and by indicating the speakers who fall into the expected groups (1995: 146).

1.3.2.4 Code-switching and power-wielding

Another interesting function of code-switching is how it is used in order to wield power. Rahman (2001: 56) states that power is a very difficult concept to use and linguists generally use it without any explanation. He says that it is something that includes both the means for giving pain and the means for giving pleasure (2001: 56). Jørgensen (1998: 237) indicates that power is derived from the access to resources in interpersonal relationships, which make it possible for an individual to change the world, influence events or attitudes. He says that this occurs according to the individuals' personal desires, in spite of any opposition by others. According to Jørgensen (1998: 237), some of these resources are related to language.

Linguistically, individuals exercise power in many different ways. Jørgensen (1998: 237) believes one can draw not only the structural command of different languages, but an individual can also use the knowledge of the different values assigned to the languages in order to achieve power. Rahman (2001: 57) introduces three kinds of linguistic power: signitive power, pragmatic power and symbolic power. Signitive power is where an individual constructs a

reality, shaping how people view the world at large, generally through social conditioning which occurs through schooling and the media. Pragmatic power is based on the communicative dimensions of the language, how a language is used in the domains of power. Symbolic power is the association of a language with different attributes in the mind of the speaker. One language may be associated with prestige, knowledge, etc., whereas another may be associated with familiarity, solidarity, etc. According to Rahman (2001: 58), these symbolic values are not an intrinsic part of the language, rather they are products of the way the language is used. If one language is used more by the elite, the educated, the powerful, then that language may become to be associated with those very things.

Jørgensen (1998: 237) talks about dominance and how it is the exercise of power in a particular setting involving particular interlocutors. In some specific situations dominance of one party may be a given thing, due to general societal patterns of power, like the relationship between a teacher and students, for example. He says that code-switching from the more powerless of two languages, into the more powerful one, may have certain meanings and that switching in the opposite direction, has different meanings (1998: 238). These meanings are related to the differences in power and status between the two languages.

In his study, Jørgensen (1998: 243) examines children and how they use code-switching for power wielding in the classroom. The bilingual children employ code-switching as a marker of individual bilingual identity, in

opposition to adult norms or to the norms of other groups of children, or both. He says that it is the use of the opposite language of the interlocutor and the direction of the code-switches is unimportant (1998: 254). In this respect, code-switching draws solely upon the particular organization of the points of view in the particular part of the conversation. He also found that the more powerful boys use code-switching more often and in more advanced ways than the less powerful boys (1998: 254-255). Jørgensen (1998: 242) claims that code-switching is a linguistic tool that bilingual students can use in negotiations of power and identity, as well as meanings, rights and obligations. However, children in conversation with adults, specifically grade school students with teachers, are relatively powerless. This is largely due to societal norms and causes conversations to be dominated by adults. In his study he found that the children would code-switch in an attempt to gain power, but when speaking to an adult, they were quite passive, most likely due to this societal difference (1998: 243).

1.3.3 Code-switching as a code in its own right

Many researchers have looked at the idea that code-switching may be a different code altogether, rather than a juxtaposition or an alternation of two or more languages. Franceschini (1998: 61) indicates that it is possible to say that code-switching can be used as a focused language, and that the mixture behaves more like a unique code than two separate ones. Legenhausen (1989: 62) includes this as one of his functions of code-switching. He says that the very fact that the speaker makes alternative use of both languages has interactional

motivations and implications. According to Legenhausen (1989: 62), this indicates that code-switching is used to avoid defining the social situation in terms of either language and culture, and therefore becomes a marker of certain ethnic identity.

Other researchers (Poplack 1980, Wei 1998) argue that the direction of the switch is unimportant. What really matters to participants is the fact that code-switching occurred, that another language was used. Wei (1998: 161) indicates that the significance is its "otherness" for the speakers involved in the conversation. They do not directly state that code-switching may be a code of its own, but they do notice different characteristics that might point in this direction.

Alfonzetti (1998: 182-207) indicates that the direction of the switch may be relevant at times and not at other times. According to her (1998: 183-186) it matters when there is an accommodation and diverging preference or when there is a reformulation. The accommodation and diverging preference pattern consists of two switches. In the first, the speaker accommodates to the language of the participant and in the second the speaker switches to his or her preferred language. Speakers use reformulations in order to correct the code they consider to be marked in a given situation. A reformulation is a conversational repair mechanism used by the speaker in order to correct the use of the wrong code. The direction of the switch does not matter when code-switching is used as a self-repair techniques, in pre-closings and sequential subordination, in story-

telling, for topic change, or for setting off quotations (Alfonzetti, 1998: 186-207).

Auer (1998: 15) believes that the whole discussion on the codes in code-switching comes down to the problem of making sure that the linguists' labellings are identical to the participants'. He states that it is not the existence of certain codes which is important, but rather the function of a certain transition in conversation (1998: 15), and he sketches a possible continuum from code-switching to a mixed code (ibid: 16). In this code-switching gradually becomes a code of its own through different steps and over time. According to Auer (1998: 17) the final step would be the emergence of a structural division between the elements originally taken from both languages, where the elements take on new grammatical functions or lexical meanings.

1.4 Attitudes towards code-switching

Attitudes towards code-switching vary greatly among members of different speech communities and even among the speakers who code-switch themselves. In interview sessions where conversational code-switching is discussed in Gumperz' (1982: 62) study, the speakers expressed many different attitudes. Some see it as an extreme form of language mixing or linguistic borrowing, attributable to a lack of education, bad manners, or improper control of the two grammars. Others characterize it as a legitimate style of informal talk. Legenhausen (1989: 61) states that the traditional and stereotypical view of code-switching is that it is a completely random mixing and alternation between two languages. According to him code-switching is most often judged in terms

of language deficiency and that there are strong normative pressures, which stigmatize code-switching in more formal situations.

It is often assumed that those who code-switch do not have a very good command of either or both of the languages involved (Timm, 1993: 96). On the other hand, as Poplack (1980: 615) and Timm (1993: 96) indicate, it has been found that the most proficient code-switchers tend to be the most proficient bilinguals. As has been demonstrated, code-switching is a very complex phenomenon that requires a lot of skill to execute properly. However, how a person perceives code-switching, may in fact affect his or her choice to code-switch, and therefore, language attitudes play a role in the decision to code-switch.

1.5 Classroom code-switching

Due to the nature of the student/teacher relationship in the classroom, code-switching may be used in a slightly different manner, or due to language polices, it may be frowned upon in the classroom. This section will look at some classroom code-switching functions, at different bilingual education polices, and I will also examine the concept of using the first language in the classroom.

1.5.1 Functions of classroom code-switching

Many of the code-switching functions previously mentioned do apply in classroom discourse. Martin-Jones (1995: 98) states that teachers and learners use code-switching to isolate different types of discourse, to negotiate or renegotiate frames of reference, and to exchange meanings. She (1995: 94)

discusses a study undertaken by Guthrie (1984), in which he identifies five code-switching functions bilingual teachers used when switching into Chinese, the first language. They include: translation, the indication of a "we" code, for procedures and directions, for clarification, and to check for understanding. Martin-Jones (1995: 98) also indicates that code-switching can be seen as a resource similar to different punctuation features in written discourse. In this way, code-switching would be a means of conveying pragmatic information to conversation participants as to how a particular utterance is to be taken in context. Blyth (1995: 152) states that code choice is largely dependent on the discourse topic or on the communicative task employed in the classroom.

Code-switching is still stigmatized in most teaching/learning contexts, and teachers and even learners themselves, generally equate it to a deficiency in one language (Legenhausen, 1989: 61). Timm (1993: 96) introduces what she refers to as "learner's code-switching". According to her, learners try to formulate sentences in the second language and then have to resort somewhere along the line to the first language for lack of knowledge about the grammatical structures or to fill a lexical gap in the second language. Timm (1993: 96) states that this is a type of code-switching, but is not "true" code-switching. "True" code-switching serves many narrative and social purposes, while the learner's code-switching is used mainly as a crutching device, something for the students to fall back on.

In an experiment of learner code-switching conducted by Legenhausen (1989: 71), he found that the learners, like bilinguals, have the feeling that the

exclusive use of either the first or the second language is situationally inappropriate. They feel code-switching to be the proper extension of their "ambivalent psychological state", thrust between a responsibility for their own learning process and the natural inclination to use their first language in any communicative situation. Blyth (1995: 153) discusses a study conducted by Zéphir and Chirol (1993) that examined classroom language use and in which they conducted a survey of three hundred students. They found that 80% of the students preferred classroom instruction in both French, the second language, and English, their first language.

The students may feel this way, but they unfortunately have no say in how the classroom is organized. As Blyth (1995: 155) points out, that even though the majority of foreign language teachers are bilingual, they often go by the norms of monolingual discourse, which does not support code-switching inside or outside of the classroom.

1.5.2 Bilingual classroom policies

Cook (2001: 403) claims that there are certain basic assumptions accepted by most language teachers, and among them are the ideas that the spoken language is more basic than written, the explicit discussion of grammar should be avoided and that language should be practiced as a whole rather than as separable parts. Most teaching methodologies since 1880 have adopted a method of avoidance of the first language, whereas more recent methods do not forbid it so much as ignore it (Cook, 2001: 404). The majority of teaching

methodologies try to suppress the use of the first language, because it is seen as harmful to the acquisition process (Legenhausen, 1989: 61).

According to Faltis (1989: 117), there are two justifiable ways of organizing language use in transitional bilingual programs. First, maintain a strict separation of the two languages on the basis of time or subject matter during the course of the program. Second, allow both languages to be used during all content instruction, but with clearly expressed guidelines for how the alternation from one language to another is to occur.

Cook (2001: 410-413) examines several methods that deliberately involve the first language in the classroom. He divides them into two types. The first one deals with alternating language approaches. In these methods, the students use the second language in one moment and in another, they use the first language. One important criterion is reciprocity, that is, both languages are involved without either one being used more than the other. One possibility is to assign computer e-pals, and a more radical approach would the alternation of languages for parts of the school day. The second way is to introduce methods that actively create links between the first and the second language. Most favour using both languages within the same lesson.

Cook (2001: 412-413) introduces three different models, that use both languages in the same lesson. The first is called Community Language Learning, or counseling learning. In this method, students talk to each other spontaneously in the second language through the mediation of the first language. The central technique uses the first language as the vehicle for giving

the second language meaning in whole sentences. The model views the first language as the initiator of meaning and attaches the second language to the first. In Community Language Learning, switching starts with the students' self created first language sentence, which is then translated into the second language. The second one is entitled Dobson's Bilingual Method. Here, the role of the first language is to help the students to grasp the meaning of the language. Like the Community Language Learning model, translation is used only to convey meaning and consists of whole sentences, however in this method, the process starts with the teachers' second language sentences being translated into the first language. This method requires the teacher to read a second language sentence aloud several times and then he or she gives the meaning in the first language. This is referred to as interpreting rather than translation. The last one is called the New Concurrent Method, or the New Concurrent Approach, which was introduced by Jacobson[1]. In this approach the teacher switches from one language to another at key points and according to particular rules. This method acknowledges code switching as a normal second language activity and encourages the students to see themselves as true second language users, who are comfortable with both languages. The role of the first language in concurrent teaching is to foster second language learning through a more natural situation of second language use.

Romaine (1995: 244, 245) identifies several types of bilingual education policies: immersion, submersion, maintenance, transitional bilingualism and a language shelter. In immersion, children are taught by using a second language,

such as the French Immersion programs in Canada. Submersion is used when the goal is to assimilate the children. This usually occurs in a minority language situation, where the minority language children are put into classes taught only in the majority language. Maintenance programs can refer to a program's goal, the maintenance of a minority language for example, or it can refer to the structure of a program, curricular maintenance of a minority language as a language of instruction. Transitional bilingualism programs, like submersion programs, seek to assimilate the students. Here the mother tongue is used in instruction in order to allow the children to move into classes taught in the majority language. A language shelter is where the children are taught in their first language in order to maintain and further develop the language and culture, while interacting with the majority language.

Blyth (1995: 155-158) examines different ways of organizing language use in the classroom as well, by examining what Jacobson says on the subject. According to Jacobson (Blyth, 1995: 155), there are three basic patterns of language choice in bilingual education classes. The first is submersion or immersion, wherein only the target language is permitted in the classroom. No distinction between the two terms is made here as it was in Romaine's (1995) book. Second is separation, with the languages restricted to a specific teacher, time of day, place or context. The third is concurrent, which has four different approaches that allow both languages in the classroom. The first approach is flip-flopping, or unrestricted code-switching. Second is concurrent translation, which requires the teacher to give two versions of every sentence. Third is

preview/review. Here, the instructional practice of previewing a lesson is done in the child's first language and then the teacher switches to the target language for the heart of the lesson. The fourth has already been mentioned, the New Concurrent Approach.

According to Jacobson (Blyth, 1995: 157), there are four criteria on which language choice should be based, they are: use both languages for an equal amount of time; the teaching of content is not to be interrupted; the decision to switch between languages is in response to a consciously identified cue; and switches must relate to a specific learning objective. According to Blyth (1995: 157), the New Concurrent Approach is a complicated process, as it involves learning specific procedures for code-switching. Foreign language teachers, who are unfamiliar with code-switching, may find it difficult to monitor their language alternation in accordance with the code switching cues created by Jacobson.

Blyth (1995: 160-161) discusses another study done by Giâque and Ely in 1990, in which they propose that code-switching be implemented at the beginning level of foreign language study. They emphasize that code-switching should only be used in the very beginning, when students have virtually no productive capacity in the target language. Students are encouraged to communicate using any words or expressions they are able to produce in the target language. They say that this kind of hybrid language is a stage in the learner's development that will quickly give way to stretches of extended discourse produced in the target language.

1.5.3 First language use in the classroom

There has been much debate as to whether or not teachers should allow or discourage code-switching in the classroom. Cook (2001: 406-410) gives three reasons why someone would avoid using the first language in the classroom. The first argument comes from first language learning. The original justification is most likely due to the way monolingual children acquire their first language. The fact that monolingual children do not have another language means that second language learners should not rely on their other language. He says that a more effective argument would be based on bilingual children. The goals of first language acquisition and second language learning are treated as identical. However, whether second language learners are successful or not has to be measured against the standards of second language users, not of native speakers. The second argument comes from compartmentalization. Successful second language acquisition depends on keeping the second language separate from the first language. This implies the goal is one of coordinate bilingualism, where the two languages form distinct systems in the mind, rather than compound bilingualism, where they form a single compound system. However, the two languages are connected in the learner's mind, second language meanings do not exist separately from first language meanings.

Cook (2001: 408) states that the uniqueness of second language use is demonstrated in code-switching, where both languages are simultaneously on line. He states that keeping the languages visibly separate in language teaching is contradicted by the invisible processes in students' minds. Language teaching

that works with this is more likely to be successful than methods that works against it. The third is the argument for second language use in the classroom. It is suggested that the teacher can maximize the provision of useful second language examples by avoiding the first language. He says that the second language will remain a set of "odd and arbitrary conventions" if students do not experience the language in meaningful ways (2001: 409). As Cook (2001: 409) indicates, it is clearly beneficial to expose students to as much of the second language as possible, to provide models of real language use for the students and to develop strategies for working out meanings of the second language from realistic classroom contexts, but these do not necessarily conflict with using the first language in the classroom.

Timm (1993: 107) believes that a case can be made for code-switching in the classroom being an acceptable form of communication and, at times, a useful or beneficial one. She states that there are a number of important questions to ask and considerations to bear in mind before teachers decide whether or not to allow code-switching in their classrooms. Timm (1993: 107) also believes that teachers need to be exposed to the research on code-switching, that has established it as a legitimate and complex form of bilingual communication. This would then allow them to make a more educated decision as to whether they should allow code-switching in the classroom or not.

Cook (2001: 418) has some suggestions about how the first language can be used deliberately and systematically in the classroom. His first suggestion is to use it to provide shortcuts for giving instructions and explanations where the

cost of the second language is too great. Second, is to build-up an interlinked first and second language knowledge in students' minds. Third, carry out learning tasks through collaborative dialogue with fellow students. The last suggestion he has, is to develop second language activities, such as code-switching, for later real life use. Researchers have proposed the metaphor of scaffolding to describe the interaction between learners and teachers, in other words, learners build their sentences by adding on to the linguistic scaffolding provided by the teacher (Blyth, 1995: 164).

Cook (2001: 413-418) introduces some different ways of using the first language positively in teaching. He first discusses how the teacher conveys meaning and how the first language can be used effectively. Teachers can use the first language to convey and check the meanings of words or sentences, or teachers can use the first language for explaining grammar. He then looks at how the teacher organizes the class. Here, the teacher can use the first language for organizing tasks; to maintain discipline; to gain contact with individual students; or for testing. Lastly he talks about the students' use of the first language in the classroom. According to him (2001: 417), this does not necessarily mean that the teacher has to know the first language, it can occur largely without the teachers' control. Here, a student may use the first language as part of the main learning activity or they can use it within classroom activities, such as group work.

Bringing the first language back into the classroom may lead, not only to improvements of existing teaching methods, but also to innovations in

methodology (Cook, 2001: 419). However, even if teachers do recognize the potential cognitive benefits of using the first language in the classroom, as shown in the research, they will most likely not find it compelling enough to give up long standing teaching methods that are based on the principle of language separation (Blyth, 1995: 168).

According to Blyth (1995: 170), the constant challenge facing teachers is to create a sense of belonging, a sense of community, despite differences in the students' second language proficiency. Most definitions of speech communities equate community membership with language use, other definitions emphasize shared attitudes and self perceptions as indicators. He (1995: 173) says that the metaphor of the community as it applies to the classroom refers to a community of people who are changing and whose change the environment should be specifically designed to support. Blyth (1995: 173) admits that this metaphor of a multilingual community has problems. It could be argued that students do not see themselves as belonging to a social group in the way members of a speech community do, and others may think it ludicrous to refer to beginning language students as bilinguals.

More recent work on the bilingual classroom has been on the ways that teachers and learners achieve a mutual synchronization of behavior in different types of bilingual teaching or learning events (Martin-Jones, 1995: 95). The social distance between the teacher and students can be a sufficient barrier to inhibit true code switching, which is an intimate and spontaneous form of communication among people who feel comfortable with one another (Timm,

1993: 108). Learners experience the classroom largely as a threatening environment, where there is much opposition between the teachers and students. This opposition is often due to the teacher's role as a norm-enforcing agency (Legenhausen, 1989: 71). As Timm (1993: 108) points out, the social hierarchy implicit in the classroom setting may, therefore be a difficult barrier to true code-switching, and it most definitely challenges the bilingual teacher who would like to use the different resources that code-switching has to offer.

1.6 Conclusion

There is much work left to be done and research needed in order for linguists to agree on a definition of code-switching and to figure out if there exists some universal uses or constraints. As Franceschini (1998: 66) says, code-switching still appears to be very difficult to handle. There has been even less work on classroom code-switching, which is greatly different from code-switching in bilingual communities, due to the teacher/student relationship. Again, research is needed in order to determine just how code-switching can be employed effectively in the classroom. It is a natural reaction for learners of a second language and bilinguals alike, to use the languages available to them to get their point across in conversation. Banning one of the languages from the classroom does not appear to be better for the student in any way, especially when the people they are trying to become, that is bilinguals, use code-switching to enhance their conversational repertoire.

Chapter II

Methodology

2.1 Introduction

This study examines the code-switching behaviors of bilingual students in two different school types: a German bilingual classroom and a French immersion classroom[2]. The sociolinguistic situation of each classroom and the participants involved will each be discussed in their own section. The results from these two classroom types will be compared to determine the purpose code-switching in these instances, and whether or not the different classroom types influence the decision to code-switch.

Preliminary observations were undertaken in each of the classroom types and my hypotheses were based on these observations. Each of the different classroom types have a different mindset or atmosphere and English plays a different role in each. My hypotheses are presented below.

- Hypothesis 1: Code-switching varies between the two classroom types.
    i. There would be a small amount of code-switching in the German bilingual classroom during the German time period
    ii. The French immersion classroom would be full of code-switching, both from the students and from the teacher.
- Hypothesis 2: Code-switching would be used more as a translation or clarification tool by the teacher.

i. Translation would occur where the teacher switches to the student's mother tongue in order to translate a word they do not know in the other language. Clarification would be used to clarify something that was said, most likely instructions or directions for an activity.

- Hypothesis 3: The students would use code-switching more as a fall-back device, due to the strict language separation in the classrooms.
    i. The students would switch to their mother tongue when they were not able to reproduce the equivalent in the target language.

2.2 Description of participants

The participants consist of students between the ages of 10 and 11 and two teachers. In the German bilingual classroom 25 students agreed to participate in my study, 15 boys and 10 girls, and only two students opted out. Nearly all of the students, 92%, speak English at home, with two of the students using Russian as the language of interaction at home. 72% of the students speak German at home as well as English, and one student indicated that Bosnian[3] is used at home as well. The majority, or 56%, of the participants have been in a German bilingual program for 6 years, the other students ranged anywhere from 4 months to 7 years in this kind of program. The students who stated they have attended a German bilingual program for a shorter time usually indicated they have taken German elsewhere, have lived in Germany, or were native German speakers.

There were 27 students in the French immersion classroom and all agreed to participate in my study. However, one student transferred into the class after my study had begun, and so I did not include her. Another student did not complete my questionnaires and so I do not have any information with regards to this participant, except for gender. Of the 27 students, 16 are boys and 11 are girls. 93% of the students speak English at home, with one student stating Lithuanian as the language of choice. Only 26% of the students speak French at home as well as English. Other languages spoken at home by the students include Spanish, Ukrainian, and Russian. 78% of the participants have been in a French immersion program for 6 years. Of these students, two stated they lived in France for four years and studied French there. One person has been in a French immersion program for 7 years, which includes a French preschool. All other students indicated they have been attending a French immersion program for 4 or 5 years. None of the speakers are native French speakers, all are second language learners and, for the majority of them, the classroom is the main exposure they have had to French.

2.3 Description of classroom types

As previously mentioned, due to the student/teacher hierarchy found in the classroom, code-switching may be used in a different manner than in other bilingual speech communities. In order to better understand this relationship, I will describe each of the classrooms involved.

The German bilingual classroom is what is referred to as a partial immersion program. In this type of program, English and a second language,

German, are both considered to be the languages of instruction. Language arts is taught using both of these languages and other subjects are taught in either language. According to the curriculum, 50% of the instructional day is reserved for German[4]. In the classroom I observed German is used for all subjects taught in the morning and English is used in the afternoon. The only exception is on Wednesdays, where German is the language of instruction for the entire day. The base language from which switching takes place is German during the German time period, or the mornings, and English during the afternoons.

The teacher does not enforce the use of German during the German instructional allotment, rather it is the students themselves who monitor the usage of English at all times. Every morning a student will write the words "Deutsch bitte" (*German please*) on the board and then students will write down names of others that they hear speaking English during the German time period. When the German time is up, the students will erase the names from the board and no action is taken against the students listed. The teacher informed me that the students started this themselves, with absolutely no direction.

According to the Government of Alberta, French should not be used less than 50% of the school day for grades one through six in a French Immersion program[5]. This gives a great deal of leeway to the teacher to develop effective teaching strategies, as they can then decide how much instructional time will be done in French. In the class I observed, French is used almost exclusively as the language of instruction throughout the day. The only time English is considered

appropriate is during English language arts, but even during this time, the teacher used mainly French and switched into English only occasionally.

Language use in this classroom was very strictly monitored, by both the students and the teacher. The teacher implemented an enforcement/incentive program at the beginning of the year, the goal of which is to get the students speaking French as much as possible, even when the teacher is not present to monitor them. In this program, the students receive fake money at the beginning of the year, and every time a student is caught using English, they must pay a "dollar" to the person witnessing the infraction. The English used does not have to be spoken, it can be written or even spelled out orally. At the end of the year the teacher provides items the students can "buy" with the money they have left. All of the items are paid for out of the teacher's own pocket. What is interesting is the students then monitor each other and involve the teacher when there is a dispute. Due to this, French will be considered the base language from which switching takes place in this French immersion classroom.

2.4 Data collection

Before beginning any actual data collection, I wanted to have a general idea of what was happening in the different classroom types. I selected three types: a German bilingual classroom, a French immersion classroom and a Francophone classroom. Based on these preliminary observations, I decided to examine code-switching in different classroom types. The French immersion class I observed was in a different school and the setting was very different from the one I collected my data from. In the original French immersion classroom,

English was rampant and employed by both the teacher and the students throughout the entire day. When I was ready to begin my data collection, the teacher that allowed me to observe her class went on maternity leave and none of the other teachers wanted to involve their classes in my study. I then had to find a new French immersion class while I was collecting data at the German bilingual school.

I decided not to include the Francophone classroom after collecting my data from the other two schools. There was very little support for my study at this school, as only half of the students had responded to my study and one them had opted out. I felt that that the lack of sufficient numbers of participants would have made it very difficult to ensure no student was recorded who opted out of my study without disrupting the classroom. I had collected enough data from the German bilingual and the French immersion classrooms and believed I could complete my study without the contribution of the Francophone data. However, I believe it would still be beneficial to conduct a study on this same topic in a Francophone school and compare it with the other classroom types.

Before beginning any data collection, I had to receive ethics approval from the University of Alberta, and due to the fact that I was dealing with the Public School Board, I also had to receive approval from the Co-operative Activities Program and the school board. Completing these applications helped to solidify what I would be doing in the classrooms and how I would go about collecting my data. I decided to video-tape the classes, as this would make my analysis that much easier. I needed to know exactly who said what and without

the video-tape, it would have been very difficult, nearly impossible, for me to assign the proper utterances to the correct student. The application process took a total of 5 months, as I had to do revisions and then had to re-submit both applications and wait for approval. I finally received approval to contact the appropriate schools and begin data collection in mid January, 2003.

The data for this study was collected between February and April, 2003 in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. Before collection I visited each school and explained to the students what I would be doing in my study. At this time I handed out the consent forms and the questionnaires and asked them to complete them and bring them back to the teacher. After I received all of the forms, I reviewed them, determined who had opted out and set up dates with the teacher when I could come in and collect my data. I attended three full day sessions at each school. I videotaped only class time. I had originally wanted to videotape during recess as well, but there was no way to ensure that students from other classes, students who had not signed a consent form, would not be on the videotape. I did take notes of what I observed during recess as well as when I was videotaping.

I wrote down what subject was being taught and any code-switching I heard, so that it would be easier for me to locate them when transcribing. This helped me immensely as I transcribed, but, due to a lot of background noise, it was very difficult to hear what people were saying, especially during group work. I also noticed in the German bilingual class, anytime I suspected the students were speaking English, they would speak very quietly and were very

aware of the people around them. Therefore, a lot of code-switching instances were missed in my data collection. Also, some of the students were further away from where I was situated with the video camera, which made it quite difficult to hear exactly what they were saying. I sat in one corner of the classroom and did not really move from this spot. I could have moved around with the camera, both teachers indicated this would be fine, but I felt this would be a disruption and would make the students pay more attention to what they were saying and, more importantly, in what language they were saying it.

I stopped recording anytime there was silent reading or the students were writing an exam. I also stopped taping when a student who had opted out, moved into my line of vision. In the German bilingual classroom, I would sometimes stop during English class, usually when the teacher was speaking or the students were working silently. My notes indicate, however, that I missed one instance of code-switching from English to German because of this. Next time I would not turn the tape off unless it was during silent reading, recess, or when a student who had opted out moved into the camera's line of sight.

My study is by no means exhaustive, but it can provide an indication of how code-switching is employed in the classroom and whether or not the classroom type will affect it. This study could be considered a pilot study or a stepping-stone from which other researchers can investigate the same topic. This could then lead to enhancements in the classroom, and provide for a better environment for students to learn a new language. This may also give teachers another tool to help students acquire a second language by using code-switching

in the classroom to get more difficult ideas and concepts across to the students, or to help them create the most effective classroom environment for their particular group of students.

Chapter III

Results and Analysis

3.1 Questionnaire results

This section will present the results of the three questionnaires I handed out to the participants. An example of each questionnaire can be found in the appendices. I will discuss each of the questionnaires separately and compare the results of the German bilingual and French immersion classrooms.

3.1.1 Background questionnaires

The background questionnaires were used in order to establish a better base for the comparison of the two classroom types. The background questionnaire I used can be viewed in Appendix A. What I most wanted to establish with the information from the background questionnaire, was to find out how many students spoke the target language at home. I was also interested to know whether or not there was a significant difference in how long each student has been enrolled in that particular program.

These results have already been presented in section 2.2 but not discussed. Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the results of the background questionnaires comparing the German bilingual and French immersion classrooms.

Table 1: Background questionnaire results

	German	French
Female students	10 (40%)	11 (41%)
Male students	15 (60%)	16 (59%)
Total students	25	27
10 years old	22 (88%)	24 (89%)
11 years old	3 (12%)	2 (7%)
Unknown	0	1 (4%)

Table 1 shows the breakdown of the students according to gender and age. As one can see, both classes are very similar in this regard. Both the German bilingual and French immersion classrooms have a majority of male students, only differencing by one percent. Almost all of the students in both classes are 10 years of age. This indicates that the classrooms are quite similar in make up and in number, which makes the comparison of the two more valid.

Table 2: Languages spoken at home

Language	German	French
English	23 (92%)	25 (93%)
German	18 (72%)	0
French	0	7 (26%)
Ukrainian	0	1 (4%)
Russian	2 (8%)	2 (7%)
Bosnian	1 (4%)	0
Spanish	0	1 (4%)
Lithuanian	0	1 (4%)
Unknown	0	1 (4%)

Table 2 shows which languages are spoken at home by the students, however the extent of which the students speak the different languages is not indicated, as the questionnaire did not ask for that information. From looking at the table it is immediately obvious that English is spoken by the majority of students, but not all. In the German bilingual classroom two students, 8%, indicated that Russian was the language of interaction at home and English was not used at all. In the French immersion classroom one student indicated that Lithuanian was used at home instead of English, and another student did not complete the questionnaire, so the language of interaction for her is unknown. What is interesting about the results of this table is that nearly three times as many students in the German bilingual classroom use the target language as a

language of interaction at home. Only 26%, one quarter, of the French immersion students speak French at home, where 72% of the German bilingual students speak German, most likely due to the fact that the majority of the German students are heritage learners and have at least one member of their family who can speak German. This means that more of the German bilingual students have the opportunity to use the target language outside of the classroom. These students have more exposure to the target language, and as such this may help them to be more proficient in that language. I believe this is most likely due to the fact that the majority of the students attending a German bilingual school are there because of a familial link. The majority of these students have German somewhere in their heritage, and as such at least one family member speaks German, also some of the students are native speakers, or have been studying German for many years. This is not the case in the French immersion classroom, where the majority of the students are attending the class because French is one of the official languages and the parents believe it would be beneficial for the students to know French. Therefore, there is no guarantee that a family member will speak French and will be able to speak it to the student.

Table 3: Length of time attending the classroom type

Length of time	German	French
4 months	1 (4%)	0
6 months	1 (4%)	0
2 years	1 (4%)	0
3 years	1 (4%)	0
4 years	0	1 (4%)
5 years	2 (8%)	3 (11%)
6 years	14 (56%)	21 (78%)
7 years	5 (20%)	1 (4%)
Unknown	0	1 (4%)

The amount of time each student has attended the different classroom types varies greatly. Table 3 illustrates this difference very well. The majority of the students in both classrooms have attended their respective types for 6 years, however, a greater majority, 78%, of the French immersion students have been in a French immersion program for this amount of time. Also, of the 78%, two of the students indicated that they had spent four of the six years in France and studied French there. Looking at the table we can see that none of the French immersion students have been in a French immersion school for less than four years. Some of the German bilingual students have only been in a German bilingual school for a much shorter period of time. Two of them have been in the class for less than a year. However, of these students, the majority indicated that they had taken German prior to enrolling in a German bilingual school. Also, the German bilingual program is the only option available to heritage learners and native speakers of German. Francophones have separate schools in Edmonton and only second language learners attend French Immersion schools.

3.1.2 Student language use questionnaires

I used the student language use questionnaires in order to get a better understanding of how the students used the target language outside of the classroom. I also wanted to ascertain with whom the students would speak the most of the target language. An example of the student language use questionnaire I used is in Appendix B. I divided up the results of the first five questions into tables, in order to better contrast the two classroom types.

Table 4: Amount of time reading German/French material not assigned by the teacher

Response	German	French
Never	7 (28%)	4 (15%)
Seldom	5 (20%)	5 (19%)
Sometimes	7 (28%)	7 (26%)
Often	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
Very often	4 (16%)	9 (33%)
Unknown	0%	1 (3%)

Table 4 presents the results of the first question, in which I wanted to find out whether the students read anything in the target language not assigned by the teacher. The two classroom types are very similar in this regard. There is not a vast majority on any of the responses, though very few chose the response "often, once a week". In the French immersion classroom the most amount of students, at 33%, chose "very often, two or three times a week". The majority of the German bilingual students ranged from "never" to "sometimes". This indicates that the majority of the German bilingual students do not read much German literature outside of the classroom. The French immersion students' results range all over and it seems that the decision to read French literature depends on the individual. A very small percentage, 4%, indicated they read French literature not assigned by their teacher once a week. The numbers then

slowly increase from "never" to "very often", with the most favored response at 33% being "very often".

Table 5: Amount of time spent watching German/French programs or movies not assigned by the teacher

Response	German	French
Never	16 (64%)	11 (41%)
Seldom	2 (8%)	5 (19%)
Sometimes	5 (20%)	5 (19%)
Often	1 (4%)	3 (11%)
Very often	1 (4%)	2 (7%)
Unknown	0%	1 (3%)

The next question deals with watching programs or movies in the target language, the results of which are above in table 5. There is more of a definitive majority when looking at these results. 64% of the students in the German bilingual class stated that they never watch German programs not assigned by the teacher. This is the most popular answer in the French immersion class as well, but with not as large a majority, only 41% of the students. The French immersion students' responses decrease as the frequency of time increases. In the German bilingual classroom, the next highest response, at 20%, is "sometimes, once or twice a month". The other three are pretty even. Some of the students indicated that they would watch German television while visiting in Germany, thus they chose "sometimes". What is interesting is that the French immersion students have a resource they are not taking full advantage of, one which is not available to the German bilingual students. That is, access to French television channels. The majority of the students do not use this resource, rather most watch programs only "seldom" or "sometimes".

Table 6: Amount of time spent living with family and/or close friends who speak German/French

Length of time	German	French
0-1 day	3 (12%)	12 (44%)
1-7 days	1 (4%)	5 (19%)
2-3 weeks	3 (12%)	0%
over 3 weeks	17 (68%)	9 (33%)
Unknown	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

With this next question, I wanted to establish how much time, if any, the students spent with family or close friends who could speak the target language. A large majority, 68%, of the German bilingual students indicated they have spent over three weeks with people who are able to speak German. Only a small number spent very little or no time with family or close friends who could speak German, around 16%. The situation is a little different in the French immersion classroom. The most popular answer, at 44%, was that the students spent no time at all to only one day with family or close friends who could speak French. However, the second highest, at 33%, response was over three weeks. The rest of the students, 19%, indicated that they had spent one to seven days with someone who was able to speak French.

Table 6A: Modified amount of time spent living with family and/or close friends who speak German/French

Length of time	German	French
0-7 days	4 (16%)	17 (63%)
2 - over 3 weeks	20 (80%)	9 (33%)
Unknown	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

If we split the results into two groups, as I have in table 6A, we can see more clearly how the two classes differ on this point. In the German bilingual class a hefty majority of the students (80%) have spent, at the very least, two

weeks with family or close friends that are able to speak German. In the French immersion classroom most of the students, 63%, have spent anywhere from one week to no time at all among family or close friends who speak French. It appears that the German students have more family or close friends whom they are able to visit for longer periods of time and with whom they are able to speak German, which is not really surprising, given the results for language use in the home. This then provides those students with another opportunity outside of the classroom to use the target language.

Table 7: Number of students who spoke German/French while living with family and/or close friends who can speak German/French

Response	German	French
Never	2 (8%)	2 (7%)
Seldom	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
Sometimes	10 (40%)	11 (41%)
Often	4 (16%)	0%
Very often	7 (28%)	4 (15%)
Unknown	0%	9 (33%)

Question four refers back to the previous question and wishes to know whether or not the students who spent time with close friends or family who could speak the target language, actually did use the target language. Table 7 presents the results. Both the French immersion and the German bilingual students have a similar pattern in this regard. The most popular response in both classrooms is "sometimes", 40% in the German bilingual class and 41%in the French immersion class. Second is "very often" chosen by 28% of the German bilingual students and 15% of the French immersion students. The majority of the students in both classes do take the opportunity to speak the target language with close friends or family, however not all of the time. There were also a high

number of students in the French immersion classroom who did not respond to this question, thus the 33% in the "unknown" category.

Table 8: People with whom the students speak the most German/French

Person	German	French
Father	6 (24%)	3 (11%)
Mother	6 (24%)	4 (15%)
Brother/Sister	3 (12%)	6 (22%)
Classmates	12 (48%)	19 (70%)
Friends	4 (16%)	7 (26%)
Grandparents	5 (20%)	0%
Great Aunt	1 (4%)	0%
Family	1 (4%)	0%
Teacher	0%	2 (7%)
Cousins	0%	1 (4%)
Friends of family	0%	1 (4%)

I was also very curious to know with whom the students spoke the target language. The fifth question on the language use questionnaire addresses this issue, the results of which are presented in table 8. The majority of the students chose more than one response in answer to this question. What I find very interesting about these results is that more of the German bilingual students indicated that they speak the most German with relatives, again supporting the fact that there are more heritage learners in the German bilingual classroom. A much lower percentage for relatives was found in the French immersion classroom, and the majority of students, 70%, stated they spoke the most French with other classmates. Another interesting comparison is that under the heading of "other", the German bilingual students chose close family members; grandparents, great aunt, and family. The French immersion students, on the other hand, chose distant or non-family members; cousins, the teacher, and friends of the family.

3.1.3 Legal guardian language use questionnaires

In addition to sending home questionnaires for the students to complete, I also included a questionnaire for the legal guardian to fill out. I wanted to know if there was any support from the legal guardian and I was also curious as to the reasons why the legal guardian chose to enroll the student in a German bilingual program or a French immersion program. An example of the questionnaire I used can be viewed in Appendix C.

Table 9: Number of legal guardians able to speak German/French

Response	German	French
Yes	20 (80%)	12 (44%)
No	5 (20%)	15 (56%)

First I wanted to know if the legal guardian could speak the target language or not, the results of which can be seen in table 9. Nearly all of the German bilingual students' legal guardians, 80%, are able to speak German. The situation is quite different among the guardians of the French immersion students. It is almost an even split, with slightly more people, 56%, not being able to speak French. Obviously, if the legal guardian is not able to speak the target language, they may be unable to assist the student in acquiring it, and there is even less opportunities for the student to use the target language. However, the extent to which the legal guardian is able to speak the target language is not known and the answer to this question then depends on what the individual believes being able to speak a language entails.

Table 9A: Number of legal guardians who speak German/French with the students if they are able

Response	German	French
Never	0%	2 (17%)
Seldom	5 (25%)	4 (33%)
Sometimes	6 (35%)	2 (17%)
Often	3 (15%)	1 (8%)
Very often	4 (20%)	3 (25%)

I also was curious to know whether or not the legal guardians spoke the target language with the students, if they were able to speak it. Table 9A presents the responses to this question. What I find interesting first off, is the fact that none of the legal guardians of the German bilingual students chose "never". If they are able to speak German, then they, at the very least, speak some German to the student. The most popular response among this group, at 35%, was "sometimes", with the results being pretty evenly spread out over the remaining three choices. The results of the French immersion legal guardians are slightly different. At 33%, "seldom" is the most popular response to this question, and what is interesting is that 17% of them never use French with students even though they are able to speak it. Exactly half of the legal guardians of the French immersion students who are able to speak French will either never or very seldom speak French to the students. I am very curious to know the reasons behind this decision, whether they do not feel confident enough in French, whether there was some societal or any other reason for the decision to not, or at least rarely use French with the students. One quarter of the legal guardians do indicate they speak French very often with the students, which is almost the same number among the German bilingual legal guardians. Again however, the extent to which they speak with the students is unknown.

Table 10: Frequency of encouragement from the legal guardians

Response	German	French
Never	0%	0%
Seldom	5 (20%)	2 (7%)
Sometimes	12 (48%)	13 (48%)
Often	5 (20%)	6 (22%)
Very often	3 (12%)	5 (19%)

The second question on the questionnaire dealt with now much the legal guardian encouraged the student to speak the target language, irregardless if they could speak it or not. The results of this can be seen in table 10. The first thing I noted was how very similar both groups were in this aspect. The most popular response was "sometimes", at 48% in the German bilingual group as well as in the French immersion group. Also, no one in either group chose "never" as a response. All of the legal guardians encourage the students to speak the target language, but the frequency of this encouragement varies. The only real difference, and it is not even that large of one, is with the response "seldom". 20% of the German bilingual group seldom encourages the students to speak German, which is more than double the French immersion students at 7%.

The next two questions I posed to the legal guardians required them to actually write out a response. Question three asked for examples of how the legal guardian went about encouraging the student to speak the target language. The majority of the legal guardians in the German bilingual group are able to speak German, and thus the majority of them encouraged the student by simply speaking German to the student. Some indicated they only spoke German in the house, or at dinner or while out shopping. Others said they encouraged the

student by reading with them or by buying German videos and books. Those who are not able to speak German, as well as some who could, would encourage German-speaking persons to speak German with the students. Still others have introduced German songs and encouraged the student to write letters in German. The legal guardians in the French immersion group did some of the same things. Those who were able to speak French would speak French with the students, one guardian mentioned how she sets a time limit and in that time both her and the student have to speak nothing but French. Many of the guardians indicated they encouraged the students to speak with siblings or friends who were also in the French immersion program. Of those who did not speak French, a lot of the guardians would ask the student to read to them or would ask them to translate English words into French. The French immersion legal guardians would also encourage students to read French books and to watch French television programs. This is much easier for the French immersion students to do, as Edmonton receives at least one French channel from Quebec. It appears that both groups try to encourage the students to use the target language in very similar ways and it also seems to depend upon the resources available to the guardian.

In response to the last question, namely why did the legal guardian choose to enroll the student in a German bilingual or French immersion program, I noticed a great deal of differentiation. The majority of the responses among the legal guardians in the German bilingual group included some aspect of retaining family heritage. Many also stated that learning a second language is

very beneficial, that it opens up additional brain pathways. However, the prevalent reason for choosing German over another language was that German figured somewhere in the family history. Other legal guardians indicated that the student had studied German while living in another country and when the family came to Canada, they wanted the student to retain the ability to speak German. Among the French immersion legal guardians no mention is made of family heritage. Nearly all of the guardians stated that French is very important to learn in Canada as it is one of the official languages. Knowing French would open doors and provide more opportunities for the students, according to some legal guardians. Many of the group also said that learning a second language is a challenging endeavor and that it develops the brain in a variety of different ways. This reason was noted in the German bilingual group as well, but by not nearly as many people as compared to the French immersion group. Many of the French immersion legal guardians also believed that learning French would provide a challenge and would make the students more culturally sensitive.

3.2 Classroom functions of code-switching

While analyzing the data from the different classrooms, I found a total of 89 incidences of code-switching, 60 of which occurred in the German bilingual classroom and 29 in the French immersion group. I will present each function of code-switching in its own section in order to give a more in depth account of what is happening in the different classroom types. I will then discuss some instances of code-switching I was unable to code and will finally summarize the six uses.

3.2.1 Fallback

Sometimes the knowledge of one language fails the speaker. This function of code-switching will be referred to as *fallback* in this thesis. This normally occurs while speaking the target language and the students would switch to English to fill the gap. This is similar to what Timm (1993: 96) calls learner's code-switching, which I discussed in section 1.5.1. Let us look at some examples to illustrate this function of code-switching. (1)[6] is taken from the German bilingual classroom:

(1) Johanna[7]: und wir haben (.) um (.) um da war (.) zwei *avalanches* gezieht (.) und einen *avalanche* (.) um (.) sieben setter um (.) sieben um (.) um
Teacher: sind sieben (.) schüler [(.) gestorben
Johanna: [ge- ge- um (.) storben und dann (.) um (.) in in um (.) sh- (.) *s- space shuttle* um sieben auch sind gestorben [( ) (.) und (.) und (.) und um (.) und (.) da war so =
Teacher: [sind sieben auch gestorben
Johanna: = (.) drei hundert vier anderen (.) und sieben auch haben gestorben
Teacher: sind gestorben (.) wirklich (.) ( ) (.) irgendwo das in der welt

(Johanna: *and we had (.) um (.) um there were (.) two* avalanches *moved (.) and one* avalanche *(.) um (.) seven setter*[8] *um (.) seven um (.) um*
Teacher: *have seven (.) students [(.) died*
Johanna: *[d- d- um (.) died and then (.) um (.) in in um (.) sh- (.)* s- space shuttle *um seven have also died [( ) (.) and (.) and (.) and um (.) and (.) that was so (.) three =*
Teacher: *[have seven also died*
Johanna: *= hundred four others (.) and seven also are died*
Teacher: *have died (.) really (.) ( ) (.) that somewhere in the world*)

In this excerpt, the student, Johanna, code-switches into English twice, and both times due to fallback. She does not know or cannot at that moment recall the correct word in German, and so she switches into English to fill this gap and finish her story. It is quite obvious by the pauses and hesitations before

the code-switch that she is attempting to produce the word in German, otherwise known as a 'word search'. These pauses and hesitations also suggest a dispreferred choice, that is, Johanna does not want to switch into English, but she has no other option. Milroy and Wei (1995: 149) discuss what they term dispreferred responses. They indicate (1995: 150) that dispreferred responses are generally marked by various structural complexities, including pauses before delivery. Wei (1998: 165) also says that it has been suggested that pauses and hesitations before producing a word often indicate the dispreferred part. In my study I found that the dispreferred choice always preceded a fallback code-switch, though not all fallbacks follow a dispreferred indication. The following example, (2), has both a fallback code-switch and a dispreferred choice followed by another fallback. This is from the French immersion data.

(2) Gandalf: um (.) ( ) il peut mettre dans le (.) un (.) verre (.) comme dans ton *pantry* (.) et puis quand quelqu'un va de: (.) *walk out* (.) ça va boom

(Gandalf: *um (.) ( ) you can put in the (.) a (.) glass (.) like in your* pantry *(.) and then when someone goes to: (.)* walk out *(.) it'll go boom*)

Here Gandalf code-switches with the word "pantry", due to a lack of knowledge in French. There are no pauses or hesitations before uttering this word, indicating it was not a dispreferred choice. However, before saying "walk out", he lengthens the last syllable before pausing and isolates the word between two breaks. This puts more emphasis on the second fallback and illustrates that the second fallback was a dispreferred choice. The question that follows is why was one fallback a dispreferred choice and in the same sentence another not?

Some possible reasons for this may be: i. code-switching twice in one sentence caused him to notice the second one, or ii. he felt he should have known the French equivalent for "walk out" but not for "pantry". Given that we are dealing with an individual's perceptions, what is going on inside his head, it may be very difficult to get a solid reason for this occurrence. One may want to conduct an interview afterwards and ask the student why he or she did this. However, whatever they claim is the reason for this will still be in doubt, as the moment would have passed and they may not be aware of the reasons themselves. A different approach may be, after the classroom observation, create a sheet of these words and ask for the students opinions on them, whether or not they feel they should know certain words in the target language or not. Or handing out a questionnaire with questions dealing with language use that came up during the observation.

Table 11: Number of fallback occurrences

	German	French
Student	25 (42%)	6 (21%)
Teacher	2 (3%)	0
Total code-switches	60	29

Table 11 shows the distribution of the use of code-switching as a fallback mechanism between the two classrooms. I separated the data between the students and the teacher, in order to show how they use code-switching differently. As is quite evident from this table, the German bilingual group used code-switching as a fallback significantly more than the French immersion students. Not only that, but fallback makes up 42% of the code-switches in the

German bilingual data set, compared to only 21% in the French immersion group. I believe this large differentiation between the two classroom types in this regard may be due, in part, to the fact that there are more heritage learners in the German bilingual classroom, which would make them more comfortable and competent in the second language, and in part to the stricter teaching strategies employed in the French Immersion classroom.

The teacher in the German bilingual class used fallback only twice and the French immersion teacher not at all. I found it very interesting that the teacher would even use fallback. An example of this can be seen in (3) below.

(3) Teacher: wir werden freitag dieses uh (.) um *unit review* sache machen

(Teacher: *friday we will do this uh (.) um* unit review *thing*)

This excerpt is taken from Wednesday, when German is spoken all day. At the end of each day, the teacher reviews the homework, which is usually written in English so that the parents of the children can read it. The teacher was going over the homework, but speaking in German. When he came across "unit review", he was unable at that moment to come up with the German equivalent. Instead he read the English word after pausing and hesitating, also deeming it a dispreferred choice.

Table 11A: Number of dispreferred choice occurrences

	German	French
Student	15	3
Teacher	1	0
Total fallback	25	6

Table 11A gives the distribution of dispreferred choices in comparison with the total number of fallback code-switches. At least half of all fallbacks are also dispreferred choices among both the teachers and the students. The teacher used fallback and dispreferred choice in exactly the same was as the students. The students usually try to avoid using English unless they have no other option. The other fallbacks, those not preceded by a dispreferred choice marker, were usually in the form of a question, where a student asks the teacher what a specific English word would be in the target language. An example of this can be seen in (4), taken from the German bilingual data, and in (5), from the French immersion class.

(4) Tatiana: wie sagt man *seal,* auf deutsch
Teacher: wie sagt man
Tatiana: *seal* auf deutsch
Teacher: *seal* (.) seehund

(Tatiana: *how do you say* seal *in german*
Teacher: *how do you say*
Tatiana: seal *in german*
Teacher: seal *(.) seal*)

(5) Ed: madame (.) madame (.) qu'est-ce que c'est (.) *often*
Teacher: souvent

(Ed: *madame (.) madame (.) what is (.)* often
Teacher: *often*)

3.2.2 Translation/clarification

I had originally divided this function of code-switching into two separate uses, translation and clarification. However, after examining the data I found it very difficult to differentiate between the two. I observed that when someone would translate an item, they usually did so in order to clarify what was said.

Conversely, when an individual wished to clarify, he or she would normally translate the word into the other language. Due to these findings, I decided to put translation and clarification together into one function of code-switching. Gumperz (1982: 78) uses the term reiteration to refer to a switch when a message in one language is repeated in another, and he says that this can be used to clarify what was said. I believe the term translation/clarification is a better representative to describe what is occurring in my data.

Table 12: Number of translation/clarification occurrences

	German	French
Student	6 (10%)	6 (21%)
Teacher	19 (32%)	13 (45%)
Total code-switches	60	29

Table 12 gives us a clear view of who uses code-switching to translate or clarify something said. As I predicted, the majority of the translation/clarification code-switches are from the two teachers. This type of switch makes up 42% of the switches in the German bilingual classroom and 66% in the French immersion classroom. The teachers would use this type of code-switching whenever they felt the students had not quite understood something in the target language, or to clarify what they had said. (6) and (7) are examples of the teachers' code-switching in order to translate/clarify in the German bilingual classroom and the French immersion classroom respectively.

(6) Teacher: ein- eine ne- eine nelke ist eine blume (.) *carnation* auf englisch (.) heisst *carnation* kennt ihr die blume

(Teacher: *a- a car- a carnation is a flower (.)* carnation *in English (.) it's called* carnation *are you familiar with this flower*)

(7) Teacher: et l'avoine comme je vous avais dit c'était du quoi (.) *oatmeal* (.) *or porridge* (.) vous rappelez

(Teacher: *and oatmeal like i told you is what (.)* oatmeal *(.)* or porridge *(.) you recall*)

In (6) the teacher presents a new word in German, "nelke", and he is unsure whether or not the students are familiar with it. He then translates the word into English in order to clarify and then continues on in German, asking the students if they understood. Much the same occurs in (7). The teacher uses a word she had introduced previously, but she was unsure if the students remembered the meaning. In order to clarify this, she switches to English and translates the French word. She then makes sure the students have understood by asking if they remember. The teachers would also code-switch to translate/clarify an expression or word when asked to by a student. Examples of this can be seen in (8) from the German bilingual class and (9) from the French immersion class.

(8) Teacher: der uran als naturschatz (.) oder bodenschatz geschrieben
[( ) warscheinlich mehr norden (.) *uranium* (.) um (.) da =
??: [was ist uran
Teacher: = mit machen sie atomkraftwerk eigentlich (.) *nuclear energy*

(Teacher: *uranium written as a natural resource (.) or mineral resource*
[( ) probably more north (.) uranium *(.) um (.) what you* =
??: *[what is uranium*
Teacher: *make nuclear energy with actually (.)* nuclear energy)

(9) Ed: madame qu'est-ce que c'est les épinards
Teacher: les épinards (.) c'est du *spinach*

(Ed: *madame what is spinach*
Teacher: *spinach (.) it's* spinach)

Both teachers probably felt the easiest way to clarify, or explain the term, would be to switch into English and translate the word. It is very interesting that the French immersion teacher would not always do this. (10) illustrates a very similar occurrence. A student asks what a "pamplemousse" is, and instead of code-switching into English to clarify the term, she simply states in French, that it is a fruit. This could be due to the fact that he asked specifically what the word was in English that caused her not to respond in that language, however, that is pure speculation, and I do not know the reasons behind this. She later asks the class if everyone has understood the term "pamplemousse", again she does not code-switch, but one of the students does so, in order to clarify the word. This exchange can be viewed in (11).

(10) Calvin: qu'est-ce que c'est le pamplemousse en anglais
Teacher: le pamplemousse c'est un fruit

(Calvin: *what is grapefruit in english*
Teacher: *grapefruit is a fruit*)

(11) Teacher: alors le pamplemousse qui était un fruit aussi est-ce que tout le monde sait qu'est-ce que c'est le pamplemousse
??: oui
Teacher: bon (.) parceque il y a quelqu'un qui ne savait pas tout à l'heure là
??: pamplemousse
??: pamplemousse
Corey: pamplemoùsse c'est le *grapefruit*

(Teacher: *so grapefruit that is also a fruit does everybody know what grapefruit is*
??: *yes*
Teacher: *good (.) because there was someone who did not know there a second ago*
??: *grapefruit*
??: *grapefruit*
Corey: *grapefruit it's* grapefruit)

The students also code-switched in order to translate/clarify. This usually occurred in response to a question posed by the teacher and a student would switch to English to translate the word, in order to clarify to others in the class. This is illustrated in (12), taken from the German bilingual class and in (13), from the French immersion group.

(12) Teacher: okay so (.) was hat er zuletzt gewunscht (.) einen
??: führerschein
Teacher: führerschein was ist das
??: *driver's license*
Teacher: erlaubnis dass man fahren kann

(Teacher: *okay so (.) what did he finally wish for (.) a*
??: *driver's license*
Teacher: *driver's license what is that*
??: driver's license
Teacher: *permission that you can drive*)

(13) Teacher: un pois c'est quoi (.) un pois qu'est-ce que c'est les petits pois là vous avez des petits pois (.) c'est pois c'est des
??: *pea*
Teacher: des légumes (.) huh

(Teacher: *a pea is what (.) a pea what is that peas you have there some peas (.) it's peas it's some*
??: pea
Teacher: *some vegetables (.) huh*)

In (12) the teacher asks what a word is and a student translates the word into English. The teacher does not acknowledge the switch, rather he describes the term in the target language, indicating that the switch to English was not appropriate in this situation. This also occurred in the French immersion classroom as illustrated in (13). The teacher asks what a "pois" is and a student translates the word into English. She responds with what she was looking for in French, and does not acknowledge the switch. Other times, as in (14), the

teacher explains the term in the target language, but also translates the item into English, indicating that a switch was more appropriate in this instance. I am not sure why switching would be better in one situation than the other. It might be due to the difficulty of the term, whether the teacher believes that the students are able to define the term in the target language or not. This is, however, speculation and the reasons behind this remain unclear. A way to test this might be to create a list of words that came up in the study, give it to both the students and the teacher and ask them to rate the words on level of difficulty and whether they feel the students should know the meaning. Also, asking the teachers to fill out a questionnaire on their opinions of this type of code-switching, when they feel it is more appropriate, may also provide some insight into this phenomenon.

(14) Teacher: hier gibts wieder ausnahmen was sind ausnahmen
(.)
??: [*exceptions*
??: [*exceptions*
(.)
Teacher: die folgen (.) nach der regel nicht okay (.) uh *exceptions* auf englisch

(Teacher: *here again are exceptions what are exceptions*
(.)
??: [exceptions
??: [exceptions
(.)
Teacher: *they don't (.) follow the rules okay (.) uh* exceptions *in english*)

3.2.3 Community membership

The next code-switching function I observed in the classrooms was to indicate membership or non-membership in the classroom community. I already discussed the notion of community membership in the classroom in section

1.5.3. Blyth (1995: 147) states that most definitions say community membership is directly related to language use and others include shared attitudes and self-perceptions as indicators.

I discovered this use for code-switching whenever someone, who was a member of the classroom community, would address me directly. Both teachers and all of the students spoke to me in English, even though I am able to speak French and German. Before presenting my study to both classes, the teacher introduced me in the different target languages and I also indicated to the students that I could speak German and French. If language use was the only criteria for community membership, then since I know the language of the community, I should be a member. However, this was not the case, which leads me to believe that attitudes and self-perceptions of the members have a definite influence on community membership.

(15) Shadow: good bye for lunch

(16) Bill: i think you'd better turn that off
Rino: yeah we get pretty crazy now
(.)
Beavis: might want an experiment on that

I found only one example of this function of code-switching in each classroom in my data[9]. (15) is from the German bilingual classroom, where a student approached me and spoke in English. I consider this to be a code-switch as it is still the morning and only German is spoken at this time. I established in 3.3 that the base language is German during the mornings, therefore this utterance is a code-switch. All of the students were aware of the fact that I could speak German, the language of the community. Shadow did not perceive

me as part of the community and indicated this by switching to English. The same thing occurs in the French immersion classroom, as can be seen in (16). Here it is a group of students talking to me. This happens right before the end of the day, but the bell has not yet rung, class is still is session. In 3.3 I stated that due to the strict language policy implemented by the teacher, French is the base language in this classroom at all times. The teacher would also only speak English to me in the classroom, even though I would sometimes speak French with her and other teachers in the staff room on breaks. Again, all of the students knew that I spoke French, yet they chose to address me in English, branding me an outgroup member.

3.2.4 Repair

The fourth function of code-switching I observed is repair. Alfonzetti (1998: 185-188) discusses two types of repair; reformulations and self-repair. Reformulations are a repair mechanism, which tries to correct the use of the "wrong code". In self-repair the direction of the switch is unimportant, rather the person speaking is correcting something that was said. The language used was not the reason for the switch as it was in reformulations. I found only two examples of repair in my data, both of which were of the same type as Alfonzetti's reformulations. I chose to use the term "repair" instead of "reformulations", as I consider it to be a better description of what occurred: repairing the wrong code. Both repair occurrences were in the German bilingual classroom and one is shown below in (17).

(17) Tatiana: *yeah we haven't got leonardo* (.) oddjob wir haben nicht
leonardo

(Tatiana: yeah we haven't got leonardo *(.) oddjob we don't have leonardo*)

This was uttered during the German time period, where German is the base language. The students were working in groups on projects that they had to present to the class. I suspected the students in one particular group were speaking English to each other, but I could not hear exactly what they were saying, as they would whisper to one another. So when Tatiana calls to another student from across the room, she starts in English, the language she had been speaking with him just moments before. She realizes her mistake and code-switches to German in order to repair the use of the wrong language choice. It was quite obvious that this was a repair of a wrong code, as immediately after speaking in English, Tatiana covers her mouth with both hands and breathes in sharply. She emphasizes the fact that she used English and indicates, by her actions, that English was not the appropriate language to use in that situation. She then repeats what she said, only this time in German, the correct language choice.

The teachers did not use code-switching as a repair mechanism in my data. This could be due to the fact that the teacher is the norm-enforcing agent in the classroom and, therefore, any language choice they make is acceptable.

3.2.5 Power-wielding

Another function of code-switching I found in the classrooms is power-wielding. I have already discussed the notion of power-wielding as a function of code-switching in section 1.3.2.4. I found only one instance of code-switching

to wield power, which occurred in the German bilingual classroom and can be seen in (18).

(18) Ariel: *i was hoping (.) i- if this was okay with you guys (.) to buy (.) maybe like whatever colour we want (.) and then then (.) um (.) i'd buy (.) [( )*

Ingrid: [wir können das am tafel schreiben

(Ariel: i was hoping (.) i- if this was okay with you guys (.) to buy (.) maybe like whatever colour we want (.) and then then (.) um (.) i'd buy (.) [( )

Ingrid: *[we can write it on the board*)

Here three girls are discussing different ideas for a project they are working on. Ariel is suggesting they buy some supplies in order to give a more colorful presentation. She is speaking in English, during the German time period. She is very unsure, as is indicated by the pauses, hesitations and word choice, and wishes to convince the other girls in the group to go along with her idea. Ingrid cuts her off and speaks to her in German, stating they do not need to do that, they can accomplish the same thing by writing on the board. I consider Ingrid's German utterance a code-switch as Ariel started the conversation in English. English is considered a marked language choice at this time, as it is during the German time period. Responding in German emphasizes the fact that Ariel used the wrong language choice, English. This adds weight to the response made by Ingrid and amplifies the disagreement with Ariel's suggestions. Also, the ways in which the girls use the different languages affects the strength of what they said. Ariel uses many pauses, hesitations and repetitions while speaking English. The word choices, "maybe" "if this was okay with you", makes her suggestion seem weaker and more passive. Ingrid's

German utterance is free of any pauses or hesitations, she speaks clearly and states what she has to say. This indicates that it is the way in which a language is used that also wields power. Ingrid does not falter and her word choice is very strong and sure. This lends power and validity to her statement that Ariel did not have by using the marked language and pauses and hesitations.

I did find three instances of power-wielding in the French immersion classroom, which I found very interesting. Code-switching was involved, but the original code-switched utterance was not used to wield power, in fact, I did not hear the original utterance in the majority of them, just the discussion afterwards. It was this discussion that intrigued me. As I stated in section 2.3, language use in the French immersion classroom is strictly monitored and the teacher had implemented an enforcement program. The power struggle took place after an individual code-switched, and was about the code-switched utterance. I witnessed several occurrences where one student accused another student of using English. Usually the accused denied the occurrence or tried to explain themselves. The other student would still demand a dollar, attempting to wield power over the accused student. The student who felt they were wronged or that they were in a weaker position, normally approached the teacher in order to lessen the accusing student's power. This is exactly what happened in (19) below.

(19) Mark: madame
Teacher: oui
Mark: est-ce que tu ( ) si je dis (.) um si je dis le mot que je pense maintenant c'était (.) j'ai dit *s.* (.) *o.* (.) et il et maintenant rino demande un dollar
Rino: j'ai dit que [( )

Ed: [oui
Teacher: qu'est-ce que j'ai dit
Rino: tu as dit que si tu um [(.) s'il y a des lettres pour (.) un mot =
Ed: [quel le mot
Rino: = anglais
Teacher: est-ce que tu as dit un mot anglais
Ed: oui [(.) *s.o.*
Mark: [j'ai dit (.) j'ai pensé j'ai dit [à lui
Ed: [j'ai pensé qu'il (.) a [dit ça =
Mark: [dit ça
j'ai expliqué
Ed: = ( )
Teacher: alors est-ce que tu penses que ce serait juste de prendre un dollar ( ) expliquer

(Mark: *madame*
Teacher: *yes*
Mark: *do you ( ) if i say (.) um if i say the word that i'm thinking about now it's (.) i said* s. *(.)* o. *(.) and he and now rino is asking for a dollar*
Rino: *i said that [( )*
Ed: *[yes*
Teacher: *what did i say*
Rino: *you said that if you um [(.) if there are letters for (.) english =*
Ed: *[what the word*
Rino: *= word*
Teacher: *did you say an english word*
Ed: *yes [(.)* s.o.
Mark: *[i said (.) i thought i said [to him*
Ed: *[i thought that he (.) [said that ( )*
Mark: *[said that i*
was explaining
Teacher: *so do you think that it would be fair to take a dollar ( ) to explain*)

In (19) it is not through the code-switch that a student attempts to wield power, but rather because of it. Rino takes the opportunity to try and exert power over Mark and force him to give him a dollar. Ed also happened to witness the exchange and is supporting Rino's position. Mark knows that he is in a weaker position and in order to break the power Rino is trying to impose, he strengthens his position by enlisting the help of the teacher. Due to the

teacher/student hierarchy, the students are generally powerless in the classroom community. Mark convinces the teacher that he is in the right and Rino loses the power he was trying to wield over him. Neither teacher needs to use code-switching to wield power, as, due to this hierarchy, they already have all the power in the classroom.

3.2.6 Personalization versus objectivization

For this function of code-switching, I am using the terms introduced by Gumperz (1982: 80). This function concerns the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance from, a statement. Whether the statement reflects personal views, knowledge or feelings, or whether it reflects a known fact or specific instances. I found two excerpts of this in my data, both produced by the teacher in the French immersion classroom, and both in the same utterance. This is shown in (20) below.

(20) Teacher: alors (.) vous avez besoin d'avoir des notes ici (.) de quoi parle (.) le texte (.) et ici vous allez avoir (.) un ( ) *webbing (.) kay web (.) and put down your notes (.) and you do webs (.) so (.) you put the topic main topic here (.) and (.) you just keep on (.) adding on or branching off whatever goes on the each (.) area (.) uh (.) (.)* ed qu'est-ce que tu fais là (.) ed (.) (.) ( ) allez promener encore comme ça (.) faire là (.) d'habitude là (.) (.) bon (.) alors un (.) et- et lance que tu te rappelles on avait fait ça là tu te rappelles (.) c'est ça ce que je veux (.) okay (.) *and then when you're done all these you (.) take and put down your notes i want you to write the summary (.) the summary is (.) o- one or two sentences (.) what the story's talking about (.) now you remember we did that (.) with (.) in science (.) we did (.) you did (.) some of it when we did* la grenouille et la baleine *(.) so (.) that's what i want you to do now (.) i want you to work (.) some of you who were away: i want you to start working on page (.) twenty four and twenty five (.) if you haven't done it already (.) i want you to go to page (.) twenty six and twenty seven (.) uh (.)* est-ce qu'on arrête parler (.) ça commence à m'énerver là

(.) s'il vous plait (.) vous voulez pas moi fachée (.) moi j'ai pas ( ) fachée non plus (.) c'est pas bon pour ma santé ni pour la vôtre (.) d'accord (.) bon (.) page vingt six (.) et vingt sept (.) alors ceux qui ont fini celui là vous allez à la prochaine (.) uh (.) et ce qui on finit celui là vous allez en vingt huit vingt neuf (.) (4 secs) uh je pense que vous avez assez un travail à faire là (.) allez y

(Teacher: *so (.) you need to have notes here ( ) about what (.) the text is saying (.) and here you are going to have (.) a ( )* webbing (.) kay web (.) and put down your notes (.) and you do webs (.) so (.) you put the topic main topic here (.) and (.) you just keep on (.) adding on or branching off whatever goes on the each (.) area (.) uh (.) (.) *ed what are you doing there (.) ed (.) (.) ( ) go walking again like that (.) do that (.) usually that (.) (.) good (.) so uh (.) and- and you start to recall that we did this there you recall (.) that's what i want (.) okay (.)* and then when you're done all these you (.) take and put down your notes i want you to write the summary (.) the summary is (.) o- one or two sentences (.) what the story's talking about (.) now you remember we did that (.) with (.) in science (.) we did (.) you did (.) some of it when we did la grenouille et le baleine (.) so (.) that's what i want you to do now (.) i want you to work (.) some of you who were away: i want you to start working on page (.) twenty four and twenty five (.) if you haven't done it already (.) i want you to go to page (.) twenty six and twenty seven (.) uh (.) *can you stop talking (.) it's beginning to annoy me (.) please (.) you don't want to make me angry (.) i don't ( ) angry either (.) it's not good for my health nor for yours (.) okay (.) good (.) page twenty six (.) and twenty seven (.) so those who finished that you go on to the next one (.) uh (.) and those who finished that you go to twenty eight twenty nine (.) (4 secs) uh i think you have enough work to do (.) go to it*)

The teacher starts out in French, the language she usually uses, even though what she is teaching is English. She is explaining the instructions of the exercise and switches into English after using an English word from the table in the exercise. The activity comes from a textbook and all the instructions and tables are in English. She continues on explaining the exercise in English, distancing herself from what is being said. She did not create this activity, it is

from an outside source and is written in English. The teacher later switches to French to talk to a student and express her displeasure with what he is doing. Switching to French, the language associated with her normal speech, makes the exchange more personal. Switching to French indicates to the students that she is involved in what she is saying. After talking to the student she continues on in French, explaining what she wants out of the exercise. She then switches back to English to continue going over the instructions with the students, distancing herself once again from the activity. When more students begin to talk while she is explaining, she switches into French to again show her displeasure, personalizing what she is saying. She asks the students to stop, indicates that this is not acceptable behavior and says how their actions are bothering her. She does not switch back into English, as she had previously, to explain the rest of the exercise. She is sufficiently agitated and continues to speak in French for the rest of the exercise.

By switching between the two languages, the teacher is indicating the degree of her personal involvement in what she is saying. She normally speaks to the students in French, regardless of the subject being taught, and especially when addressing them directly. French is the language associated with personal interaction and is the language of the classroom community. The use of English is normally forbidden, except during the English time period. However, even during this time period she rarely speaks English. The occurrence of the teacher speaking English is very unusual and a marked choice. English is also not the

language of the community and, therefore indicates a distance from what is being said.

3.2.7 Unknown occurrences of code-switching

In my data I found three occurrences of code-switching that I was unable to assign to a function and two occurrences where I was unsure if the item actually was a code-switch. Table 13 gives the break down of the occurrences between the two classrooms and among the students and teachers. As you can see, the majority of the unknowns are from the German bilingual class, which is not surprising as they had more instances of code-switching.

Table 13: Number of unknown occurrences

	German	French
Student	2	1
Teacher	2	0
Total code-switches	60	29

I will discuss each of the unknown occurrences separately in order to explain exactly why I found it difficult to code them. I will start with the one from the French immersion class, which is presented in (21). Here the student, Corey, is speaking to the teacher and switches to English mid-sentence. I was too far away and he spoke too quietly for me to hear exactly what he said. I therefore do not have enough context to ascertain why he switched to English. I do, however, find it very interesting that he spoke English while talking to the teacher, knowing the rules of the classroom and the status of English. I am very curious to know why he would use the marked language choice in this situation, where he is almost guaranteed to be reprimanded.

(21) Corey: madame je vais ( ) ils ont *( ) else*
Teacher: mais tu ( ) on sait savoir corey pourquoi tu parles en anglais

(Corey: *madame i'm going ( ) they have* ( ) else
Teacher: *but you ( ) we know corey why did you speak in english*)

I will now discuss the unknown occurrences from the German bilingual classroom, starting with the two that I am unsure whether or not they are code-switches. One is from the teacher and can be seen in (22), the other is produced by a student and is in (23).

(22) Teacher: was vielleicht eine gute idee ware ist wenn ich eine extra *kopies* erregeln für eu- für euch kopieren würde

(Teacher: *what perhaps would be a good idea is if i make extra* copies *for y- for you*)

(23) Tatiana: und auch in ( ) hatte ein *fire* in [(.) ein *fire*
Teacher: [ein- ein was (.) ein feier oder ein feuer
Tatiana: feuer
Teacher: feier ist party

(Tatiana: *and also in ( ) had a* fire *in [(.) a* fire
Teacher: *[a- a what (.) a party or a fire*
Tatiana: *fire*
Teacher: *party is party*)

In (22) the teacher uses the word "kopies". I was unsure if this was an English word and so I spelled it the German way, with a "k". However, I looked up the word in the Collins German Dictionary and found "kopies" to be the wrong plural form of the word "kopie". According to the dictionary, the correct plural is with an "n", which would make it "kopien". The English plural of "copy" is with an "s", which makes it "copies", closer to what the teacher said in (22). I was still very hesitant to code this as a code-switch, as I did not have enough information or context to support that decision. If this is a code-switch,

I am still not sure what the purpose of the switch in this phrase would be. I would be tempted to label this either a borrowing or interference from English, as the words are so close, phonetically and morphologically. This is very similar to what occurs in (23). The German word "Feier", party in English, and the English word "fire" are very similar phonetically, but extremely different semantically. At first I thought this was a code-switch, maybe due to English interference as the words are so close. However, the following exchange with the teacher put some doubt on that reasoning. He asks for clarification of the term Tatiana used and makes the distinction between the two terms "Feuer" and "Feier". Tatiana means "Feuer", "fire", but says "fire" or "Feier". Since the words are so similar, I felt I was not able to accurately say whether the word was German or English, or it, again, might simply be a borrowing.

(24) Teacher: okay machen wir das (.) bitte nicht zu hause gehen kannst und wenn die eltern fragen *what'd you learn today no:thing*

(Teacher: *okay let's do that (.) please don't go home and when your parents ask* what'd you learn today no:thing)

The code-switch in (24) was made by the teacher in the German bilingual classroom. It was at the end of the day when he was going over homework for the students. He was asking what the students had learned that day and was getting no reply. He then said what is found in (24), asking the students to not go home and tell their parents they learned nothing that day at school. He uses English to say what he thought the parents would ask and the following reply of the students. I found it interesting that he chose English, especially when 72% of the legal guardians speak German. I am still unsure as

to the function of the code-switch in this instance. I can speculate and say it may be a distancing mechanism, as the parents are not part of the classroom community, or that nearly all of the parents speak English, which is the language of interaction outside of the classroom, the language they are most likely to use when speaking to their children.

(25) Anson: is this yours
Cyberguy: yes
Anson: where'd mine go

The last unknown occurrence of code-switching is shown in (25). I consider this to be a code-switch as this exchange happened in gym class and during the German time period. Here the language of interaction is supposed to be German, but these two students chose to use English. I am unsure as to why they are using English here, and there is not enough context to explain the choice. It is a discussion about which basketball belongs to whom. The teacher is still speaking in German and the students are aware they should be using German. I do not know why the students chose English and could not assign a function to this occurrence.

3.2.8 Summary

The distribution of all the different functions that occurred in my data is shown in table 14. I divided the table between the different classrooms, among the students and the teacher and also between the functions themselves.

Table 14: Summary of code-switching functions

Functions	German		French		Totals
	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
Fallback	25 (68%)	2 (9%)	6 (43%)	0%	33 (37%)
Translation/clarification	6 (16%)	19 (82%)	6 (43%)	13 (87%)	44 (49%)
Community Membership	1 (3%)	0	1 (7%)	0	2 (2%)
Repair	2 (5%)	0	0	0	2 (2%)
Power wielding	1 (3%)	0	0	0	1 (1%)
Pers vs. Objt	0	0	0	2 (13%)	2 (2%)
Unknown	2 (5%)	2 (9%)	1 (7%)	0	5 (6%)
Sub-totals	37 (62%)	23 (38%)	14 (48%)	15 (52%)	
Classroom totals	60 (67%)		29 (33%)		
Total	89				89

The majority of the German bilingual students, 68%, use code-switching as a fallback mechanism, followed by translation/clarification with 16%. There is not such a large majority among the French immersion students. Rather, the students use code-switching as a fallback equally as much as translation/clarification, both at 43%. These two functions, fallback and translation/clarification, together make up the vast majority of code-switching occurrences in both classrooms, 84% in the German bilingual classroom, 86% in the French immersion class and 86% of the total code-switches. Only two code-switching functions occurred in the German bilingual class and not in the French immersion class, namely repair and power-wielding. I believe the more diverse array of functions found among the German bilingual students may be due to the large number of heritage learners in the classroom and to the less severe language policies present in that classroom.

Between the two teachers, both used code-switching mainly in order to translate or clarify a statement. 82% of all the code-switches from the German

bilingual teacher and 87% of the French immersion teacher's switches were for this reason. The other functions are completely different for each of the teachers. The French immersion teacher used code-switching in order to contrast between personalization and objectivization, where the German bilingual teacher code-switched as a fallback and had two unknown occurrences of code-switching. Another interesting point to note is that there is not that great of a difference of who code-switched more. The teachers code-switched almost as much as the students, and in the case of the French Immersion teacher, she actually code-switched more.

As predicted, code-switching is used more as a translation/clarification tool among the teachers, almost exclusively so. However, I did not expect the teacher to use it as a fallback, as the German bilingual teacher did. Also, as predicted, the students code-switched mainly as a fallback device, though the distinction was not as great among the French immersion students. They used code-switching for the purpose of translation/clarification as much as they used it for fallback.

There were in total 89 occurrences of code-switching in my data. 60 or 67% of the code-switches came from the German bilingual classroom and 62% of those were from the students, 38% from the teacher. The rest of the code-switches, 29 or 33%, occurred in the French immersion classroom, with 48% produced by the students and 52% from the teacher. I am not surprised there are more code-switching occurrences in the German bilingual classroom and believe that the fact that there are more heritage learners and native speakers in the

German class and that the use English is more acceptable than in the French immersion classroom are possible influencing factors. As Franceschini (1998: 65) states, rare insertions of code-switching indicate a small range of code-switching is available to the individual and/or there is a low degree of social acceptance of this behavior. This is the case in the French immersion classroom, as the use of English is very much stigmatized, which makes code-switching very difficult. Due to the strict language separation and enforcement program implemented by the teacher, the students in the French immersion classroom use as little English as they can in order to avoid the negative consequences attached to that language. However, due to the fact that these students are second language learners, this particular strategy may be necessary for this group of students, in order to create an optimum environment for students to learn French.

3.3 Metalinguistic commentary

Another phenomenon I observed in the classroom, which does not deal with code-switching directly, but which does deal with first language use in the classroom, was the metalinguistic talk in the classrooms. Romaine (1995: 114) defines this as the use of language to talk about or reflect on language. She also states that it allows the speaker to step back from the comprehension or production of language in order to analyze its form. I found six instances of metalinguistic commentary in both classes, as is illustrated in table 15 below.

Table 15: Number of occurrences of metalinguistic commentary

	German	French
Student	1	5
Teacher	0	0
Total occurrences	6	

Nearly all of the metalinguistic commentary, or 5 of the 6 instances, occurred in the French immersion classroom. The one instance of metalinguistic commentary I found in the German bilingual classroom is found in (26). Here the teacher has asked a student a question in German and the student focuses on language and clarifies that the teacher wants the response to be in German. I found two instances of this in the French immersion classroom as well, where the student asks the teacher to clarify the language to be used. In (27) below, Joey uses metalinguistic commentary, focuses on the language, and asks the teacher permission to use English. He is still very hesitant and asks twice before he goes ahead with English.

(26) Torsten: willst du nicht auf englisch sagen
Teacher: lieber nicht (.) du kannst kann man das gut auf deutsch erklären

(Torsten: you don't want it said in english
Teacher: please no (.) you can one can explain it well in german)

(27) Joey: elle changeait des (.) de couleur et si (.) um si elle est plus lourde comme (.) le: l'eau et puis léger de le uh (.) de (.) peux je dire le mot en anglais
Teacher: oui
Joey: uh
Teacher: l'eau est plus léger
Joey: de le est-ce que je peux dire le mot en anglais
Teacher: oui
Joey: uh (.) *syrup*
Teacher: le sirop
Joey: oui

(Joey: *it changed some (.) colour and if (.) um if it is heavier like (.) the: water and then light of uh (.) of (.) can i say the word in english*
Teacher: *yes*
Joey: *uh*
Teacher: *the water is lighter*
Joey: *of the can i say the word in english*
Teacher: *yes*
Joey: *uh (.)* syrup
Teacher: *syrup*
Joey: *yes*)

Two other occurrences of metalinguistic commentary are discussions on which language a particular student had used. I already presented one of these instances in (19), the other is below in (28). Here two students are fighting over whether or not James had written something in English. They continue on with the metalinguistic commentary until the teacher gets involved and ends the discussion, this is also what occurs in (19).

(28) Corey: madame ( ) écrire en anglais
Teacher: ( ) en anglais c'est ( ) en anglais
James: je n'ai pas écrit
Corey: mais tu as
James: non j'ai pas écrit le nom
Corey: oui tu as james

Teacher: alors il y a un problème là lui donne des dollaires et c'est finit (.) [cinq
James: [je n'ai pas même écrit ni lit quelque chose
Teacher: tu n'as pas écrit
James: j'ai fait des petites lignes
Teacher: bon (.) alors
(.)
Corey: mais (.) mais il a fait ( )
Teacher: mais c'est trop tard

(Corey: *madame ( ) wrote in english*
Teacher: *( ) in english it's ( ) in english*
James: *i didn't write*
Corey: *but you did*

James: *no i didn't write the name*
Corey: *yes you did james*

Teacher: *so there is a problem here give him the dollars and it's done (.) [five*
James: *[i didn't write nor read anything*
Teacher: *you didn't write*
James: *i made some small lines*
Teacher: *good (.) so*
(.)
Corey: *but (.) but he did ( )*
Teacher: *but it's too late*)

(29) Gandalf: ( ) de la monde
(.)
Antoine: c'est pas de la monde c'est du monde

(Gandalf: *( ) of the world*
(.)
Antoine: *it's not of the world it's of the world*)

The last instance of metalinguistic commentary is shown in (29). Here the student is neither asking for clarification on the correct language to be used, nor are students discussing the language use of a particular individual. Instead what is occurring is one student is correcting the language use, the grammar of another student. Antoine is using language to focus and correct the mistake made by Gandalf. It is very interesting that a student would correct another's grammar and I wondered on the reasons for this. The conversation did not carry on any further after this, so I do not have enough context to find out why this occurred. It might be because Antoine wanted to wield a bit of power over Gandalf, or it could be due to a wish to help Gandalf improve his French grammar. These are, however, merely speculations and I do not know the reasons behind the decision to correct Gandalf's grammar.

I attribute the fact the majority of the metalinguistic commentary occurrences happened in the French immersion class, to the strict separation of the languages and the enforcement program implemented by the teacher and also to the students' level of competency in French. The students are so aware of the use of language in the classroom, it seems obvious that they would talk about it more and be more concerned with the correctness of their speech. Language is much more of a focus in the French immersion classroom, it is constantly on the minds of the students, and talking about it only seems natural.

3.3.1 Induced metalinguistic commentary

In my data I found three occurrences of metalinguistic commentary that differed from the others previously discussed. All were spoken by either one or the other teachers in the two classrooms. The difference is, rather than using language to focus or reflect on language themselves, the teachers would use the language to force the students to focus or reflect on their own language, the choice in particular. I termed this phenomenon induced metalinguistic commentary. Here, the purpose is to cause someone else to be aware of the language they are speaking or going to speak, by talking about language. This forces them to reflect on their own language use. (30) is an example of this taken from the German bilingual class and (31) is from the French immersion classroom.

(30) Teacher: so (.) meine lieben wir sprechen wiedermal deutsch bitte schön bitte schön bitte schön

(Teacher: *so (.) my dears we're speaking german again please please please*)

(31) Teacher: n'oubliez pas s'il vous plait (.) de (.) sh- sh- (.) de suivre les règles dit par moi quand on va à la bibliothèque

(Teacher: *don't forget please (.) to (.) sh- sh- (.) to follow the rules set by me when you go to the library*)

In (30) the teacher had been reading an announcement from the school administration in English. After doing so he said what is found in (30), reminding the students to speak German, as it is still the German time period and that is the language they should be using. Prior to (31) a student asked if they could speak English in the library. The teacher informs him that the rules are no different in the library and they should speak French among themselves. She then addresses the entire class with (31), forcing them to reflect on their language and reminding them of the proper choice.

Both teachers are using language to cause the students to focus on their own language. They are not themselves reflecting on language and this is why I found these instances to be different from the other examples of metalinguistic commentary found in my data. I used the term "induced" as it means to lead on to a specific action by persuasion or influence, or to cause or bring on something[10]. The teacher has more power in the classroom and is able to influence a student to reflect on their own language much easier than another student for example.

Chapter IV

Concluding Remarks

The term "code-switching" may have many different variations on its definition, but this does provide for a more adaptable term that researchers can slightly alter, in order to better fit in with the study being done. However, as Auer (1998: 21) points out, a clarification of code-switching must be made, in order to determine its relevance. Many different factors affect how an individual will code-switch, including language perceptions and competency. The classroom situation, with the teacher/student hierarchy, can provide a hindrance to students wanting to employ the different languages available to them and switch codes.

The individuals in this study code-switched for many different purposes; as a fallback; in order to translate or clarify; to indicate community membership; to repair; to wield power; or to distinguish between personalization and objectivization. A fallback is usually a single word or term switch from the target language into the dominant language, when knowledge of one language fails the speaker. This may or may not be preceded by pauses or hesitations, suggesting a dispreferred choice. Translation or clarification involves repeating or translating something said in one language into the other language, in order to clarify what was being said. Again, this is usually a single word or term switch. Switching to indicate community membership is when an individual belonging to a group that has a particular language associated with it, speaks a different language to someone who does not belong to that specific group. A repair

occurs when a person switches from one language to another in order to correct what they perceive to be a wrong code choice. Code-switching for power-wielding takes place when an individual specifically uses a language choice different from another person, in order to obtain some kind of power over that person. Switching to distinguish between personalization and objectivization occurs when a speaker wishes to involve or distance him or herself from whatever is being said. To indicate involvement, or to personalize a statement, a speaker may switch into a different language. Conversely, if someone wants to distance themselves, remain objective, they may switch into another language to accomplish this.

The results of this study can be better explained by comparing them with the questionnaire results. The background questionnaire information proved that the two classrooms were very similar and that the comparison of the two would be more valid. The background questionnaire also showed how the German bilingual students had more opportunities to speak German with family members and to spend more time with close friends or family members who are able to speak German. The language use questionnaire also indicated that the majority of German bilingual students speak German with other family members. This implies that these students would be more at ease with code-switching, as they have more chances to use both languages outside of the classroom. This then explains why there were more diverse arrays of code-switching from the German bilingual students than from the French immersion students and suggests that the students have a higher level of competency in

German. The French immersion students code-switched only as a fallback, for translation or clarification and to indicate community membership. The German bilingual students used these functions of code-switching, as well as repair and power-wielding.

The reasons for attending a German bilingual school and a French immersion school also affect how a student code-switches. The majority of students in the German bilingual class have some kind of family heritage with the German language. German figures somewhere in their family, someone spoke it, or still does today. This provides stronger ties to the language and, perhaps, a stronger desire to use and learn the language. There may also be more support from the family for the student in the German bilingual classroom. The French immersion students do not have this family heritage associated with the French language. Instead, the majority of legal guardians indicated that they chose French immersion, because French is one of Canada's official languages and it would be very beneficial for the student to know it. The reasons for attending the class and learning French would not be as strong as the German students and the desire to learn French may not be as important to the French immersion students. This would then affect how they used the language, how proficient they were in it, and therefore, how they would code-switch.

I believe the differences between the two classrooms are, first, due to the fact that there are several native German speakers and mostly heritage learners in the German bilingual classroom. These students would be more competent in German, which increases code-switching frequency and diversity. Second, I

believe the stricter strategies employed in the French Immersion classroom may also affect an individual's decision to code-switch. Using English is practically forbidden in the classroom, and therefore code-switching is not always possible. However, the teacher may have decided to use these stricter strategies, because of the different levels of competency among the students involved.

4.1 Implications for the classroom

Over the course of my study, I noticed several things that may have some negative implications for the classroom. With the very strict language separation and enforcement of language use in the French immersion classroom, I observed many power struggles among the students. Some students would take these rules and try to wield power over other students because of them. However, the teacher did achieve her goal of getting the students to speak mainly French with a very creative idea, and employing these strategies might be more effective for this particular group of students.

The students have two tools available to them, that is two languages they can use to express themselves and to learn. It seems wasteful not to use both of these tools in some way. As mentioned in 1.5.3, there are different ways of involving the first language positively in the classroom and I believe that school administrators and teachers should at the very least be aware of them and the potential benefits. Forcing the students to behave as monolingual speakers, which they are not, may prove to be detrimental. A better comparison would be with fully bilingual children, who use all of the languages they have available to them.

4.2 Study limitations

My study covered only three days of normal classroom discourse from both of the classes. This brief time period was not enough to allow the students to feel comfortable with my presence in the classroom and they still remained slightly wary of their language use around the camera and me. Often they would whisper and I could not hear what they were saying, nor did the video camera pick it up.

As mentioned in 2.4, I did not move around, as I felt that would be a disruption to the class and would cause the students to be more aware of their language use. Due to this, and a lot of background noise, I undoubtedly missed several occurrences of code-switching. Also, I stopped recording when the students were working silently or when the teacher was doing a lengthy lecture. Unfortunately, my notes indicate that I missed several instances of code-switching because of this, and one of the code-switches was from English into the target language, which would have been ideal for analysis.

Another limitation has to do with the questionnaires filled out by the students and legal guardians. The choices on many of the questions were very subjective and they could have meant different things to different people. I have no way of knowing if everyone interpreted the responses the same way or not. This then calls into question the validity on some of the responses, namely the ones with the choices of "never", "seldom", "sometimes", "often" and "very often", unaccompanied by a small explanation. I unfortunately have no way of

knowing how each individual interpreted these results. I also did not ask for the first language of the students, which would have been helpful in the analysis.

4.3 Directions for further research

The results of this study, though far from conclusive, suggest that code-switching is in use in the classroom community by both the teachers and the students and lend support to the qualitative interpretations discussed in this study. They also suggest that the classroom type, as well as language competency may influence code-switching production. Although the study contains methodological deficiencies, a review of the limitations may help others in their future research.

This study does indicate tendencies that other researchers may want to investigate. Examining how different levels of language competency affects the teaching strategies employed would be a very interesting and beneficial study to undertake. Other researchers may want to observe the classes for longer periods of time, in order to get a more diverse range of data. This would also allow for the students to become used to the presence of the researcher, and it would be interesting to see if the researcher would become a part of the classroom community. This study looked at comparing two different classroom types, a German bilingual and a French immersion class. Another investigation may want to look at comparing other types of classrooms, or someone may want to focus on one particular type. An investigation could then be made into the code-switching differences within one particular classroom type and would then

provide a more accurate comparison of how different classroom atmospheres affect code-switching and language choice.

Comparing classrooms that do allow use of the first language with classrooms that do not, would also be an interesting study to undertake. This would then provide insight into the diverse ways code-switching is employed in the classroom. It may also show how code-switching and the presence of the first language in the classroom is beneficial and not harmful to the student's language acquisition process.

4.4 Final statement

The findings discussed in the previous section demonstrate how differently code-switching is employed in the classroom community. This study suggests that the classroom type, as well as language competency may be two possible influencing factors in the decision to code-switch. The atmosphere or the status of the different languages in the classroom, and how well an individual speaks the languages may affect whether or not a student will switch between the languages involved. Teachers and policy makers need to be aware of this in order to provide a better learning environment, where the strategies used would be designed for the specific students involved and where all the tools available to the student can be put to good use, that is where knowing more than one language would be a help rather than a hindrance.

Endnotes:

[1] See Faltis (1989) for a detailed description of Jacobson's New Concurrent Approach.

[2] While my study certainly derives from the literature on code-switching, in my precise case, I am really dealing with first language use in the second language classroom by both students and teachers.

[3] "Bosnian" was known as Serbo-Croatian until the division of Yugoslavia.

[4] For a detailed discussion of the German Bilingual curriculum, please see the curriculum resource listed in the Bibliography.

[5] For a detailed discussion of the French Immersion curriculum, please see the Government of Alberta website referred to in the Bibliography.

[6] Transcription conventions: code-switches are presented in italics; pauses are indicated by round brackets with a period, (.); speech overlap is indicated by square brackets []; unknown utterances are indicated by empty brackets, ( ); an equal sign, =, indicates the continuation of an utterance by the same speaker; a hyphen, -, indicates and incomplete word or stutter; a colon, :, indicates a lengthening of the preceding syllable; question marks, ??, indicate the exact speaker is unknown; translations are given underneath the example in italics and between brackets.

[7] To protect their identities, all the names of the participants have been changed.

[8] I am unsure of the meaning this student is trying to convey with this word, the meaning I found in the dictionary for the word "Setter" made no sense in this context.

[9] There were other occurrences, but the video tape did not pick them up.

[10] This is the definition of "induce" as found in The New International Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language, page 495, Trident Press International, 2002 edition.

Bibliography

Alfonzetti, Giovanna. The conversational dimension in code-switching: between Italian and dialect in Sicily. pgs 180-211 in Auer, Peter (ed) Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge. 1998.

Auer, Peter. The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. pgs 115-133 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

Auer, Peter. Introduction: bilingual conversation revisited. pgs 1-24 in Auer, Peter (ed) Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge. 1998.

Blyth, Carl. Redefining the boundaries of language use: the foreign language classroom as a multilingual speech community. pgs 145-183 in Kramsch, Claire (ed) Redefining the boundaries of language study. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers. 1995.

Clyne, Michael. Constraints on code-switching: how universal are they? pgs 739-764 in Linguistics Vol. 25 (2). Amsterdam: Mouten de Gruyter. 1987.

Cook, Vivian. Using the first language in the classroom. pgs 402-423 in The Canadian Modern Language Review / La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes. 57 (2). 2001.

Faltis, Christian J. Code-switching and bilingual schooling: an examination of Jacobson's New Concurrent Approach. pgs 117-127 in Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development. Vol. 10 (2). Avon: Bank House. 1989.

Franceschini, Rita. Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics: proposals for a dual focus model. pgs 51-72 in Auer, Peter (ed) Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge. 1998.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. pgs 68-87 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

German Language Arts (Kindergarten – Grade 12). Curriculum. Edmonton: Edmonton Public Schools. 2000.

Gumperz, John. Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1982.

Jørgensen, J.N. Children's acquisition of code-switching for power-wielding. pgs 237-258 in Auer, Peter (ed) Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge. 1998.

Legenhausen, Lienhard. Code-switching in learner's discourse. pgs 61-73 in International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. Vol. 27. Heidelberg: Julius Greos Verlag. 1989.

Martin-Jones, Marilyn. Code-switching in the classroom: two decades of research. pgs 90-111 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

Milroy, Leslie and Wei, Li. A social network approach to code-switching: the example of a bilingual community in Britain. pgs 136-157 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

Muysken, Pieter. Code-switching and grammatical theory. pgs 177-198 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. A lexically based model of code-switching. pgs 233-255 in Milroy, Leslie and Muysken, Pieter (eds) One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching. Cambridge: University Press. 1995.

Poplack, Shana. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Español: toward a typology of code-switching. pgs 580-618 in Linguistics. Vol. 18 (2). The Hague: Mouton Publishers. 1980.

Rahman, Tariq. Language learning and power: a theoretical approach. pgs 53-74 in International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 152. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 2001.

Romaine, Suzanne. Bilingualism. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 1995.

Timm, Lenora A. Bilingual code-switching: an overview of research. pgs 94-112 in Merino, Barbara J., Trueba, Henry T., and Samaniego, Fabian A. (eds) Language and Culture in Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press. 1993.

Wei, Li. The "why" and "how" questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. pgs 156-176 in Auer, Peter (ed) Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge. 1998.

www.learning.gov.ab.ca/french/FLA/abrege/IMM_5.pdf

Appendix A:
Sample Background Questionnaire

Your answers on this questionnaire will allow the researcher to make comparisons with other students in two different schools. You are under no obligation to answer any question on this questionnaire you are uncomfortable with. You will be assigned a pseudonym for use in the reporting of research findings.

☐ **I choose NOT to participate in this study.**

Student Name:_____
Pseudonym:_____

Please check (√) the appropriate response to the following items:

- Sex ___Male ___Female
- Age _____
- I speak the following languages at home:
  ___English ___French ___German ___Other (please specify)_____

For how long have you been attending a German bilingual/French Immersion school? _____

Appendix B:
Sample student language use questionnaire

Name of student:_____

- How often do you read German/French newspapers, magazines or literature that have not been assigned by your teacher?
  ___Never ___Seldom(once every 2 or 3 months)
  ___Sometimes(once or twice a month) ___Often(once a week)
  ___Very often (two or three times a week)

- How often do you watch German/French movies or television programs not assigned by your teacher?
  ___Never ___Seldom(once every 2 or 3 months)
  ___Sometimes(once or twice a month) ___Often(once a week)
  ___Very often(two or three times a week)

- How much time have you spent living with family and/or close friends who speak German/French?
  ___0 hours – 1 day ___1 day – 7 days
  ___2 days – 3 weeks ___over 3 weeks

- If you spent time living with family and/or close friends, did you speak German/French with them?
  ___Never ___Seldom
  ___Sometimes ___Often
  ___Very often

- Who do you speak German/French with the most?
  ___Father ___Mother
  ___Brother / Sister ___Classmates
  ___Friends ___Other (please specify)_____

- Is there anything you specifically do to improve your German/French outside of the classroom?
  ___Yes ___No
  If yes, could you please describe this.

Appendix C:
Sample legal guardian language use questionnaire

Name of student:_____

Name of legal guardian:_____

- Are you able to speak German/French? ___Yes ___No
  If yes, do you speak German/French with the student asked to participate in this study?
  ___Never ___Seldom ___Sometimes ___Often ___Very often

- Do you encourage the student to speak German/French?
  ___Never ___Seldom ___Sometimes ___Often ___Very often

- If you encourage the student, how do you achieve this?

- Why did you choose to enroll the student in a German bilingual/French Immersion school?

Appendix D:
Sample consent form

I am a graduate student in the Masters program in French and German Applied Linguistics in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultural studies at the University of Alberta. I am undertaking research on the language use of bilingual students in the public school system as part of my Masters Thesis. In addition to using the results of this study in my Masters Thesis, I would also like to include them in conference presentations. The study will be carried out over a maximum of four full day sessions. The students will take home and complete a background questionnaire and a language use questionnaire with you. You, as the student's legal guardian, will also be asked to fill out a modified language use questionnaire. The majority of the research will be collected through direct observation of the classroom and video-taping of language use of both the instructor and the students. The use of video-tape is necessary in that I need to know who said what, and without taping, it would be very difficult, nearly impossible, for me to keep track. All students enrolled in the class are asked to complete the questionnaires. However, participation in my study is completely voluntary in that you or the student may choose not to release the material produced during these tasks to me. You are also free to designate whether I may use any data collected for my Masters Thesis, other scholarly endeavors or both. Even if you or the student initially choose to allow for any data to be used for research purposes, you or the student are free to have your data withdrawn from the study at any time. Should you or the student choose not to participate, there will be no repercussions on the student's mark in class. This study has no bearing on the work the student does in class. The student will only be identified by a pseudonym in my study. Names and other identifying information will not be given. Conversations among bilingual children and the teacher will be reported, and in the case that any individual's responses are discussed, the individual will be named by a pseudonym only.

Please check (√) each statement to show that you agree.

___I consent _____ to voluntarily participate in this study.
(name of student)

___I understand that he/she can withdraw at any time.

___I understand that there are no risks involved in participating in these research activities.

___I understand that the decision to participate or not will have no effect on _____'s grade in class.
(name of student)

___I consent that the information from the background questionnaire and the language use questionnaire, as well as the data collected in the classroom can be used by the researcher in her Masters Thesis and in conference presentations.

___I understand that _____ will not be identified in any research report.
(name of student)

Name of legal guardian:_____ Name of student:_____

Signature:_____ Date:_____

For student to complete:

I _____ wish to participate in this study (please circle): yes / no
(your name)

Principal Investigator:
Robin Coogan
Dept. of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta

Supervisor:
Dr. Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain
Dept. of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta

Appendix E:
Sample teacher consent form

I am a graduate student in the Masters program in French and German Applied Linguistics in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies at the University of Alberta. I am undertaking research on the language use of bilingual students in the public school system as part of my Masters Thesis. In addition to using the results of this study in my Masters Thesis, I would also like to include them in conference presentations.
The study will be carried out over a maximum of four full day sessions. The majority of the research will be collected through direct observation of the classroom and the video-taping of language use of both yourself and the students. The use of video-tape is necessary in that I need to know who said what, and without taping, it will be very difficult, nearly impossible, for me to keep track. Participation in my study is completely voluntary in that you may choose not to release the material produced during these tasks to me. You are fee also to designate whether I may use any data collected for my Masters Thesis, other scholarly endeavors or both. Even if you initially choose to allow for any data to be used for research purposes, you are free to have your data withdrawn from the study at any time. You and the students will only be identified by a pseudonym in my study. Names and other identifying information will not be given. Conversations among bilingual children and yourself will be reported, and in the case that any individual's responses are discussed, the individual will be named by a pseudonym only.

Please check (√) each statement to show that you agree.

___I choose to participate in this study.

___I understand that I can withdraw at any time.

___I understand that there are no risks involved in participating in these research activities.

___I agree that the student's individual grade in class will not be affected by their participation or non-participation in this study.

___I consent that the information from the background questionnaire and the language use questionnaire, as well as the data collected in the classroom can be used by the research in her Masters Thesis and in conference presentations.

___I understand that I will not be identified in any research project.

Name of teacher:_____

Signature:_____ Date:_____

Principal Investigator:
Robin Coogan
Dept. of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta

Supervisor:
Dr. Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain
Dept. of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta